

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 65222

Title: Cell-free DNA liquid biopsy for early detection of gastrointestinal cancers: A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 03475728

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Switzerland

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-01

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-10 15:11

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-28 03:08

Review time: 17 Days and 11 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 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

I was glad to review this narrative systematic review, partially conducted in line with PRISMA checklist. The topic is interesting and appealing. English language would probably require some further minor polish. As for literature search method, the Authors only screened PUBMED database. It is advisable to screen more than one database when conducting a systematic review (i.e. EMBASE, Scopus). I wonder if the Authors decided to proceed as they did according to a specific motivation. A very important part of the PRISMA checklist is reporting results: in the present systematic review there is not any assessment of risk of bias for each studied included in the analysis (i.e. item #18, item #21). The Authors should implement this part. As for reporting results, the Authors could have performed a pooled-analysis – when possible in accordance to outcome measures, data availability and samples homogeneity – in order to obtain a unitary outcome indicator instead of describing, in a narrative-review fashion, other studies results independently (i.e. colorectal cancer). I think that a pooled/meta-analysis of presented results would add further value and novelty to the manuscript.