

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 90868

Title: PRECISION IN DETECTING COLON LESIONS: A KEY TO EFFECTIVE SCREENIN POLICY BUT WILL IT IMPROVE OVERALL OUTCOMES?

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05913552

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BPharm, MSc

Professional title: Academic Research

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Ethiopia

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2023-12-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-16 15:32

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-21 06:35

Review time: 4 Days and 15 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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

1. The title requires modification 2. Abstract should be reorganized having background, method, discussion and conclusion 3. Key words please add 4 or 5 key words 4. The background is some what good 5. There is no method described. There should be a method indicating how the author selects information sources literatures 6. Subtitles discussion should be incorporated 7. Some of the References are outdated, it is better to avoid literatures published before 2015. 8. Quality a. Language editing should be done, there are many fragments of ideas. b. Every paragraph should have a reference. c. text alignment should be justified d. standard reference writing tools(software like endnote, Mendeley or others))should be used.