

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19090

Title: Relationship between intestinal microbiota and colorectal cancer

Reviewer's code: 02799802

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-05-12 09:41

Date reviewed: 2015-06-05 23:17

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This minireview tried to present a comprehensive overview on the relationship between microbiota and colorectal cancer (CRC), and also emphasized the possible scope of this understanding in the development of future therapeutics. The authors mentioned about the possible underlying mechanisms of conversion of procarcinogens to carcinogens. The basic understanding of the relationship between microbiota and CRC would be important for better prediction, prevention and treatment of CRC. The topic of this minireview is quite appropriate for this journal and title accurately reflects the content of the review. However, the review has omitted some major issues that need to be addressed. Major comments: 1. The relation between the Apc gene, intestinal polyps and CRC is well-established. The authors must discuss about the microbiota changes in Apcmin/+ mice and also patients suffering from hereditary intestinal polyposis. Some major articles published in this regard are not referred to in the review (for eg, Cell. 2014 Jul 17;158(2):288-99.; Cell Host Microbe. 2013 Aug 14;14(2):207-15.). 2. The role of microbiota metabolites in CRC development is not discussed in the review. 3. The authors should take care of the appropriateness of the reference cited against any specific information. For example, Reference number '3', Gueimonde M. et al..... cited against

second paragraph of the Introduction doesn't fit against the given information. Ref 80 in Table 1 is not related to CRC. 4. Under the subsection "Factors influencing gastrointestinal microbiota" only the impact of diet on modulation of microbiota and its influence in tumour development with limited information is discussed. Authors should either narrow down the subsection title to 'diet' or include other factors like Xenobiotics, age etc. Moreover, dietary compounds have both positive and negative impacts on the composition of gut microbiota and cancer progression. Authors should discuss both positive and negative impact of different dietary compounds like nondigestible carbohydrates, proteins, fats, phytochemicals etc. preferably in tabular form with their impact on host microbiota and the reported underlying mechanisms. 5. 'Figure 1' should be more informative and clearly understandable. Author should outline the factors lead to dysbiosis and then the consequences of dysbiosis on alteration of physiological and immunological system of host, which actually play a crucial role in the conversion of procarcinogens to carcinogens. 6. Incorporating a section on the impact of the manipulation of the microbiota using Probiotics, Prebiotics on the development of CRC would improve the quality of the review. 7. Authors have mentioned "SLC5A and GPR109A the two major receptors of butyrate...", which is not true. SLC5A is a butyrate transporter, whereas GPR109A is a butyrate receptor. Minor comments: 1. Authors should follow the recommended guidelines to write the Binomial names of the species.