

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 81099

**Title:** BMI-1 activates hepatic stellate cells to promote EMT of colorectal cancer cells

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06335490

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** Doctor, MD

**Professional title:** Chief Physician, Doctor, Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-02-01

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-02-02 02:51

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-02-04 12:22

**Review time:** 2 Days and 9 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well designed paper and worth to be published.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 81099

**Title:** BMI-1 activates hepatic stellate cells to promote EMT of colorectal cancer cells

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04232981

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Bangladesh

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-02-01

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-02-02 00:31

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-02-04 15:11

**Review time:** 2 Days and 14 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript. 2. The results and discussion section is very weak and no emphasis is given on the discussion of the results like why certain effects are coming in to existence and what could be the possible reason behind them? 3. Conclusion: not properly written. 4. Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results. 5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature. 6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript. 7. English is modest. Therefore, the

authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 81099

**Title:** BMI-1 activates hepatic stellate cells to promote EMT of colorectal cancer cells

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04232981

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Bangladesh

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-02-01

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ru Fan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-31 14:08

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-31 18:25

**Review time:** 4 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results.