

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 6741

**Title:** Comparison of dietary habits of patients with colorectal neoplasias and their first-degree relatives

**Reviewer code:** 02543541

**Science editor:** Zhai, Huan-Huan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-10-29 10:37

**Date reviewed:** 2013-11-15 05:42

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The conclusion is quite broad and the data which the authors gathered does not support it. Given the size of the study and the lack of outcomes data, at most the study may generate hypotheses which may then be investigated in future studies. What is needed is to be able to quantify the attributable risk which specific dietary habits confer. In this study, there is no evidence that diet has any influence of CRN at all. That men have a less healthy diet than women is a well described phenomenon, as is their lesser healthcare uptake.
2. The authors do not mention their hypothesis until the very end of the results section. These should be placed at the end of introduction to add clarity to the paper. As it stands, the introduction lists the goal of the study as the simply comparison of dietary habits between two groups, with no mention of the expected findings.
3. Since one of the a priori hypotheses of the study was to compare gender difference in dietary habits, it seems odd that the investigators did not age and gender match the controls to the cases. This would have prevented the imbalance seen in this study. This is a significant weakness of the study in its present form.
4. While there is certainly data to tie dietary factors (e.g. red meat consumption) with CRN, the men in this study without CRN ALSO had an unhealthy dietary pattern, so the link between CRN and diet seen in other studies was not seen in the present study. Therefore, general associations between dietary factors and CRN should not be highlighted in the discussion.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 6741

**Title:** Comparison of dietary habits of patients with colorectal neoplasias and their first-degree relatives

**Reviewer code:** 02453722

**Science editor:** Zhai, Huan-Huan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-10-29 10:37

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-01 23:18

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major revisions: 1. Pg 4, last paragraph: the authors indicate that they collected data on fat intake. What type of fat (saturated, unsaturated ??) was data collected on? What were the cutoff values for low versus high intake? 2. How was the dietary intake information collected? Was there a specific tool used? Self-reported? Diet diary? Interview ?? 3. Pg 6 Discussion: the authors highlight the potential of the gut microbiome to provide alternations in risk. I am not certain what the relevance is of this section given that 1) no differences in dietary intake were found; 2) no assessment of the microbiome was performed in this study. 4. The limitation of the generalizability of the findings not only relates to the high prevalence of the colorectal cancer and the small number of study participants. The mean ages of the groups are also very different. In light of the long progression to cancer, this warrants some mention. Further, the results of this study are representative of just one site. 5. Table 1; There should also be an evaluate of the homegenity of the various populations in this table. Perhaps the results of Chi squared could be incorporated as the sixth column in the table. 6. Recommend that the paper be reviewed for word choice and sentence structure by a native English speaker. Minor revisions Pg 4, 2nd paragraph suggest that the author may want to use "familial" rather than "familiar" 2. Pg 5 3rd paragraph: "FDR were than ..." suggest "FDR were then..."