

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 31615

**Title:** Circulating cell-free DNA for early detection of colorectal cancer: a review of the literature

**Reviewer's code:** 00070758

**Reviewer's country:** Bulgaria

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-08-01 18:51

**Date reviewed:** 2016-09-26 15:08

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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper is interesting and targets a large number of specialists in the field. Minor language polishing is required. More information about other circulating cell free DNA markers is needed. Otherwise I would recommend the title to be changed.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29092

**Title:** Circulating cell-free DNA for early detection of colorectal cancer: a review of the literature

**Reviewer's code:** 03001965

**Reviewer's country:** Denmark

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-08-01 18:51

**Date reviewed:** 2016-09-29 19:31

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] 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"/> [ Y ] No	<input 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"/> [ Y ] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Circulating cell-free DNA for early detection of colorectal cancer: a review of the literature - by Galanopoulos et al. The authors have performed a fine review of the literature relating to the present topic, and I only have a few remarks to be considered: 1) Though understandable, off-course, the manuscript would benefit from editing by a native English speaking person. 2) In the introduction the authors write that currently available screening tests for early detection have proven ineffective due to costs and a rather low participation rate. I am not agreeing with this statement completely. No doubt, the currently available tools/methods could be better, likewise the participation rate, but stating that there are ineffective is not correct. Screening (FOBT and colonoscopy if positive) were introduced nationwide early 2014 in Denmark, and data from the national databases already clearly shows a decline in percentage of patients that are diagnosed with stage IV disease. So currently available strategies do work - but yes there is clearly room for improvements. 3) Introduction, three lines down from the above mentioned statement: New biomarkers, with higher sensitivity and specificity - how are they to reduce the expected incidence of



## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

CRC? Better markers may help identifying patients with CRC at an earlier stage, but they hardly reduce the overall incidence – unless they become so specific that the implementation leads to identification and removal of a larger number of polyps – that potentially could lead to cancer over time.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29092

**Title:** Circulating cell-free DNA for early detection of colorectal cancer: a review of the literature

**Reviewer's code:** 02739495

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-08-01 18:51

**Date reviewed:** 2016-08-08 10:59

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 checked="" 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 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

Galanopoulos M et al. review in their manuscript the circulating cell-free DNA for early detection of colorectal cancer. The paper is of interest but some parts are unclear and need editing: 1. The title suggests that the content is furthermore focused in the application of circulating cell-free DNA in colorectal cancer early detection, but these expectations are not properly met. Thus "early detection" is not proper. 2. In abstract section, the author mentioned "In this brief review, we epitomize the current knowledge on the research in circDNA biomarker – primarily focusing on DNA methylation – as a potential blood-based test for early detection of colorectal cancer.". However, the author also emphasis on the other content such as molecular pathways, cell-free circulating DNA-based markers. So, the abstract needs to revise. 3. In "EXISTING SCREENING MODALITIES TO AVOID CRC" section, "Screening modalities" is little related to the theme of this article, so it needs to short the content. 4. In "Methods to detect circDNA-related markers in blood", the author only introduces the methylation-related circDNA detect methods. So, the subtitle needs changed.