

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 64655

Title: Colorectal cancer in Arab world: A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 05771605

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Author's Country/Territory: Egypt

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-26 08:43

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-26 08:55

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

None other than language improvement.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 64655

Title: Colorectal cancer in Arab world: A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 05721372

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Romania

Author's Country/Territory: Egypt

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-26 13:44

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-02 04:06

Review time: 5 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 Grade E: Do not publish
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors should compare the prevalence rates with other rates from the world. Refer to: I. Păun, V. D. Constantin, B. Socea, S. Bobic. The impact of environmental factors upon the incidence rate of colorectal cancer. *Ciencia e Tecnica Vitivinicola*, 2015, 30/2 (11): 99-133. The authors should precise the limits of the study.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 64655

Title: Colorectal cancer in Arab world: A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 05776245

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BSc, MSc

Professional title: Academic Research, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Poland

Author's Country/Territory: Egypt

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-29 15:35

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-02 17:05

Review time: 3 Days and 1 Hour

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
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Summary: the Authors reviewed available data on CRC in Arab world. They used PubMed, Scopus, WOS, EBSCO and Wiley repositories to conclude on the topic. The PRISMA 2009 checklist and research flow is followed. In my opinion the manuscript is suitable for publication in WJGO, although not without appropriate corrections.

Strengths: searching aforementioned databases to retrieve relevant articles, irrespective of the language or the publishing year. The retrieved articles were screened and selected by three independent authors, which is another advantage. Regarding my concerns:

1) In the "Core tip" section, there is a sentence: "Although only few studies from have addressed the prevalence and incidence of colorectal cancer in the Arab world [...]". What the "from" word refers to? I suspect some part of sentence is missing or "from" could be completely deleted; the sentence will still make sense then. 2) First sentence of Introduction: after CRC you used "third" word, and then "2nd". In my opinion this should be standardized. The whole sentence can be like: Colorectal cancer (CRC) is the third most common cancer (10.0%) and the second leading cause of cancer deaths worldwide (9.4%) [1]. 3) The second sentence of Introduction: "There is rise of the incidence rate of CRC worldwide till the last decade". If I understood properly, this should be rewritten with proper English. For this case, I suggest for example: "Since the last decade, an increase in the incidence of CRC has been observed worldwide". Overall, few other language polishing will be necessary throughout the entire manuscript (e.g. there are some punctuation errors in Authors contribution, Abstract etc; Figure 1 is lowercase). 4) The sentence of Introduction: "To our knowledge, this is no systematic review addressed the CRC prevalence and/or incidence in the Arab World to date." <-- In this sentence, the "this is no" words should be changed to e.g. "there is no". Also, the "addressed the" can be changed to "on". 5) Results, the second sentence: The part in brackets begins with square bracket but ends with round bracket. I suspect the Authors

intention was to put the whole part in round brackets on both sides. 6) Results, third paragraph: "Four out of those studies" started the sentence. I think that "Out of these studies, four showed" will fit and sound better. 7) Results, next sentence after the one mentioned above in 6). "Rasul, et al[7] in their retrospective analysis in Qatar reported" will sound better if you change it to e.g. "In their retrospective analysis on Qatar's area, Rasul et al [7] reported" 8) Few "cancer colon" terms was used. I suspect the Authors wanted to mention "colon cancer" 9) Results section: "Is Saudi Arabia MOH" refers to Ministry of Health? This abbreviation could be described when first mentioned. 10) The first sentence of Discussion: This is quite a long phrase, yet still understandable. To shorten it a little, you can delete "colorectal cancer" before "cases (10.0%)" as the whole sentence is about CRC which is mentioned twice in the same sentence before. 11) Discussion, second paragraph: "being prevailing"; maybe change it to "dominant"? Will it work and maintains the sense? 12) The sentence of Discussion is too long: "Also, Almatroudi[14] in his large epidemiological study of CRC in Saudi Arabia, showed that there is marked increasing incidence of CRC from 2006 to 2016 attributing that for the large scale screening program that increased the case detection rate and the change towards more unhealthy life styles with higher incidence in big cities like the regions of Riyadh, Makkah, and Eastern Province where westernized life style and flourishing industries are more evident" Please rewrite it or use a full stop somewhere in the middle. Also, "attributing that for" should probably be "attributing TO", as far as I am concerned.

13) The last paragraph of Discussion: "The persistence rising trend" <-- could it be changed to something else for better understanding? 14) The last paragraph of Discussion: the sentence "This was justified in part by the favorable outcomes of screening and decline in incidence in older age groups were not able to overcome the rising incidence of CRC in younger population" contains many "in". How about changing it to "This PARTLY JUSTIFIED by the favorable outcomes of screening and

decline in INCIDENCE WITHIN older age groups were not able to overcome the rising incidence of CRC in younger population"? 15) The last paragraph of Discussion: "CRC screening in UAE from 2012 through 2019 demonstrated" could be changed to "CRC screening in UAE from 2012 to 2019, which demonstrated", for better understanding.

16) Table 1 is very illegible. I suspect this is due to pasting it to Word document and the fact that many details are provided there with many columns which are too packed to present data clearly. Obviously this can be fixed during production process, however you can try to adjust it a little or move it to supplementary materials, if possible. I also noticed few completely empty parts of table, is this intended? Maybe some "no data" in italics will be suitable? I saw that there is such term in specific part of table, but not in others. This should be standardized. 17) Figure 1 could be misleading sometimes. I think that arrows with excluded records should be located a single level higher (there are two such cases; I mean the arrows directed to the right, with $n=1,674$ and $n=1,327$ cases). In other words, if you exclude 1674 out of 3299 records which yields 1625 records, in my opinion the 1674 should be on the level of 3299, not 1625. The same applies to 1327 on the level of 298 - this should be on the level of 1625. See <https://www.wjgnet.com/1948-5204/full/v12/i2/228.htm> for reference.

===== Last but not least question about Recommendations section, although it is only for my curiosity and not related to manuscript corrections: "Based on the available literature, it is recommended to undergo multi-center prospective studies". Can Authors perform such multi-center study/trial in the future?