

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18732

Title: How to improve colon cancer screening rates

Reviewer's code: 01804246

Reviewer's country: Romania

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-04-30 09:26

Date reviewed: 2015-08-30 05:31

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting paper regarding an important topic - colorectal cancer screening. But there are several issues that should be changed or added to the manuscript before is ready for publication. These are presented in the attached file with comments.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18732

Title: How to improve colon cancer screening rates

Reviewer's code: 03270846

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-04-30 09:26

Date reviewed: 2015-08-19 19:55

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I am really pleased to review your fine manuscript. This is a very important manuscript which includes significant knowledge on colorectal cancer screening tests. The title is a topic of interest to all gastroenterologists, surgeons, radiologists, oncologists, nurses and other health professionals. At this point; I have recommendations improving this manuscript: ? The study must be well conducted in order to have a high readability. ? The section of the "Convincing professionals and population", is not organized well. There are gaps between sentences and the paragraphs. ? You can make some additions into the "Convincing professionals and population" section. For example, you can emphasize the effect of cognitive characteristics (attitudes, health beliefs, eg.) to screening participation. You can also point to increase screening participation in high risk populations. ? Some parts of the manuscript are very long; it can be shortened, especially the sections titled "Screening tests" and "Screening methods" can be reorganized. ? The manuscript should have "conclusions" or "recommendations to the reserchers". ? It should be emphasized what it has been adding to the literature already known and what new contribution this new information has been making to the practice. ? You can add few references, so the number of references can be increased. In general,



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

this is an appropriately written manuscript and valuable for publication. The authors identify the need for increased knowledge about how to increase colorectal cancer screening. The authors also describe new methods in colorectal cancer screening.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18732

Title: How to improve colon cancer screening rates

Reviewer's code: 02533622

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-04-30 09:26

Date reviewed: 2015-08-27 22:16

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

Interesting article where it is describe the importance of the application of the screening tests for CRC,from the point of view of the three strategies: convinces the population, achieve higher efficacy in standard screening tests and develop new more sensitive and efficacious screening methods. Improvement points: ? Explain the place of the new screening tests that the authors suggest in nowadays ? It is of great interest the description of methods of detection and prevention. However, I believe that the paper will improve, if the authors introduce their recommendations about the CRC detection Methods and the methods of CRC prevention, both in the abstract as in the article. ? For a better understanding of the article, define the general population and at risk population. And their screening recommendations. ? In the section "Methods of CRC prevention" on page 7, colonoscopy is introduced as one of its methods. In the penultimate paragraph states "if any of the above tests have positive results the patient receive a medical referral to undergo colonoscopy". Redundant.