

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 72135

Title: Inflammation, microbiome and colorectal cancer disparity in African-Americans:
Are there bugs in the genetics?

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05120663

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: PhD

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-10-28 22:20

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-31 09:20

Review time: 2 Days and 10 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="radio"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="radio"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="radio"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="radio"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Minor revision <input type="radio"/> Major revision <input type="radio"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Anonymous [<input type="checkbox"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="checkbox"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors wrote a quite interesting review on intersections of inflammation, microbiome, genetics, and colorectal cancer (CRC). This is generally of high interest. Following things should be addressed and the authors should improve the paper. Prevention should be the top topics since this discusses CRC risk. It is currently hidden in the middle. The authors should discuss more prevention and early detection as main topics since they are important in reducing the cancer burden much more effectively than treatment. The authors touch on environment only little. There are many environmental, dietary, and lifestyle factors that influence the microbiome (in both intestine and other tissue), inflammation, immune system, pathogenic mechanisms. The authors should emphasize factors other than diet too, eg, smoking, alcohol, obesity, diabetes, bowel habits, etc. The authors touch on genetics. There are also influences of germline genetic variations on both immune system and microbiota. Gene-by-environment interactions should be emphasized. In these lines, research on dietary / lifestyle factors, microbiome, immunity, and personalized molecular biomarkers in tumor is needed for prevention and treatment research. The authors should discuss molecular pathological epidemiology research that can investigate those factors in relation to microbiome, molecular pathologies, immunity, inflammation, and clinical outcomes. Molecular pathological epidemiology research can be a promising direction. Strengths and challenges of molecular pathological epidemiology (Ann Rev Pathol 2019, Curr Colorectal Cancer Rep 2017, etc.) should be discussed. According to web/net searching, in relation to microbiome, Hum Genet 2021 also seems a good one. In relation to health disparity research, Expert Rev Mol Diagn 2021 seems a good one.

Tables must have HUGO-designated official gene symbols for all genes. The authors used proper standardized SNP IDs. The same principle holds for gene names. Some names (eg, TGFb and many others) are not official symbols. Please check every gene at www.genenames.org

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 72135

Title: Inflammation, microbiome and colorectal cancer disparity in African-Americans:
Are there bugs in the genetics?

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06083984

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BSc, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Belarus

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-11 07:01

Reviewer performed review: 2021-11-19 15:56

Review time: 8 Days and 8 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The work presented in the “INFLAMMATION, THE MICROBIOME, AND COLORECTAL CANCER DISPARITY IN AFRICAN- AMERICANS: Are there bugs in the genetics?” manuscript raises interesting questions, related to the patient-specific cancer prediction and treatment. However, I have some critical comments, please, find them below. 1. Please, provide figures, relevant to the content of the manuscript. 2. Tables and figures should be understandable without text. In the current form, however, figures are not currying any useful information and tables are very hard to read. 3. In general, the manuscript is separated into several sections not connected to each other, jumping from one topic to another. Please, organise the manuscript in a logical way, so the reader could follow it step by step. 4. Please, provide a clear conclusion (without references) and state clearly the advantages and significance of the suggested “integrated concept”, comparison to the current and/or other concepts.