

**ESPS Peer-review Report**

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 6099

**Title:** Colorectal Cancer Surveillance: What's New and What's Next?

**Reviewer code:** 00159630

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-10-02 20:25

**Date reviewed:** 2013-10-07 11:40

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This manuscript had been well reviewed . No other comments.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 6099

**Title:** Colorectal Cancer Surveillance: What's New and What's Next?

**Reviewer code:** 02446404

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-10-02 20:25

**Date reviewed:** 2013-10-09 18:20

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article by Johnie Rose et al. deals with an hot topic in Gastroenterology: the surveillance in patients underwent to colorectal cancer treatments. The authors reviewed studies comparing surveillance strategies in order to establish the best follow-up for early detection of recurrent and metachronous disease. Interestingly they also discussed whether the reduction of the mortality in patients underwent to surveillance depend exclusively on the prevention of CRC related mortality. The paper deserve attention because of the importance of the topic. However the authors should carefully notify the selection criteria adopted. Whether the authors did not perform a systematic review they should have to justify clearly in the text because they exclude some articles.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 6099

**Title:** Colorectal Cancer Surveillance: What's New and What's Next?

**Reviewer code:** 01333103

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-10-02 20:25

**Date reviewed:** 2013-10-21 17:58

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is well written and comprehensive. I also believe that it contains innovative elements that give added value to the review by projecting it in the near future. Mynor comments - Paragraphs "what should colonoscopy role play" and "what are the quality of life implications of CRC surveillance?". In these paragraphs the authors repeat things they have previously reported in the text. I suggest to condensate these concepts in two lines or to eliminate them. - In paragraph 'Balancing the benefits and harms' the authors report of possible damages induced by colonoscopy and/or psychological damages, but they do not report, in patients long-term survivors, the possible damage induced by ionizing radiation.