

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 80457

Title: Influence of methyl donor nutrients as epigenetic regulators in colorectal cancer: A

systematic review of observational studies

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05774529

**Position:** Editorial Board

Academic degree: FASCRS, MD, PhD

Professional title: Deputy Director

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-06 14:40

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-13 14:01

Review time: 6 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Diet is a major factor in the aetiology of colorectal cancer (CRC). Dietary methyl donors might influence DNA methylation during carcinogenesis of CRC. This review attempts to discuss the relationship between the effects of methyl donor intake and polymorphisms. However, it is difficult for this review to explain the interaction between genetic and dietary data. The introduction and discussion sections of the manuscript are verbose due to lack of correlation between studies.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 80457

Title: Influence of methyl donor nutrients as epigenetic regulators in colorectal cancer: A

systematic review of observational studies

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00068967

**Position:** Editorial Board

Academic degree: MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Academic Fellow, Deputy Director, Full Professor, Professor, Senior Editor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-28

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-24 01:19

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-06 08:51

**Review time:** 12 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>



Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors: This is an very interested and important study. CRC development is of great complexity, and routinely been regarded as the results of adenomas or polyps advancement, while both of them have the complicated genetic background and signal regulations. As regarding the epigenetical mudulation, methylation is the hotest topic. However, what the mechanism of outer methyl donor can influence the methylation remaining uncertain, such as the efficacy of methyl uptake, transportation, and the final involvement in methyl related gene expression. Hence, this review seemingly has not resolved it comprehensively, though you provide the limitation of the research about this point, that is rather another issue. Quality of the manuscript is excellent, though lacking novel findings to extend the view of readers. Based on you work, the results and conclusion nay be proper. Future works should strengthen the issues which mentioned above.