

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript Type: SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

Colorectal cancer in Arab world: A systematic review

Manuscript NO: 64655

Authors' Responses to reviewers and editors

Reviewers	Comments	Authors' Responses	Changes made in page/s
Reviewer 1 comments and authors' responses			
Reviewer 1 General comments	In my opinion the manuscript is suitable for publication in WJGO, although not without appropriate corrections. Strengths: searching aforementioned databases to retrieve relevant articles, irrespective of the language or the publishing year. The retrieved articles were screened and selected by three independent authors, which is another advantage	Thank you for finding our Manuscript is suitable publication in WJGO.	-
Reviewer 1 Comment 1)	In the "Core tip" section, there is a sentence: "Although only few studies from have addressed the prevalence and incidence of colorectal cancer in the Arab world [...]". What the "from" word refers to? I suspect some part of sentence is missing or "from" could be completely deleted; the sentence will still make sense then.	We did the correction	All changes in yellow highlights page 5
Reviewer 1 Comment 2)	First sentence of Introduction: after CRC you used "third" word, and then "2nd". In my opinion this should be standarized. The whole sentence can be like: Colorectal cancer (CRC) is the third most common cancer (10.0%) and the second leading cause of	We did the correction	All changes in yellow highlights, page 5

	cancer deaths worldwide (9.4%) [1].		
Reviewer 1 3)	The second sentence of Introduction: "There is rise of the incidence rate of CRC worldwide till the last decade". If I understood properly, this should be rewritten with proper English. For this case, I suggest for example: "Since the last decade, an increase in the incidence of CRC has been observed worldwide". Overall, few other language polishing will be necessary throughout the entire manuscript (e.g. there are some punctuation errors in Authors contribution, Abstract etc; Figure 1 is lowercase).	We did the correction, but some were English edited.	All changes in yellow highlights, page 5
Reviewer 1 4)	The sentence of Introduction: "To our knowledge, this is no systematic review addressed the CRC prevalence and/or incidence in the Arab World to date." <-- In this sentence, the "this is no" words should be changed to e.g. "there is no". Also, the "addressed the" can be changed to "on"	We did the correction, but some were English edited.	All changes in yellow highlights, page 5
Reviewer 1 5)	Results, the second sentence: The part in brackets begins with square bracket but ends with round bracket. I suspect the Authors intention was to put the whole part in round brackets on both sides.	We did the correction	All changes in yellow highlights page 6
Reviewer 1 6)	Results, third paragraph: "Four out of those studies" started the sentence. I think that "Out of these studies, four showed" will fit and sound better.	We did the following correction Among these studies, four showed— According to English Editing Advise	All changes in yellow highlights in page 7
Reviewer 1 7)	Results, next sentence after the one mentioned above in 6). "Rasul, et al[7] in their retrospective analysis in Qatar reported" will sound	We did the correction	All changes in yellow highlights in page 7

	better if you change it to e.g. "In their retrospective analysis on Qatar's area, Rasul et al [7] reported"		
Reviewer 1 " 8)	Few "cancer colon" terms was used. I suspect the Authors wanted to mention "colon cancer"	We did the correction	All changes in yellow highlights
Reviewer 1 9)	Results section: "Is Saudi Arabia MOH" refers to Ministry of Health? This abbreviation could be described when first mentioned.	We did the correction	All changes in yellow highlights in page 7
Reviewer 1 10)	The first sentence of Discussion: This is quite a long phrase, yet still understandable. To shorten it a little, you can delete "colorectal cancer" before "cases (10.0%)" as the whole sentence is about CRC which is mentioned twice in the same sentence before.	We did the correction	All changes in yellow highlights in page 7
Reviewer 1 11)	Discussion, second paragraph: "being prevailing"; maybe change it to "dominant"? Will it work and maintains the sense?	We did the correction. CRC incidence has always been known for being an indicator of higher levels of socioeconomic development and being dominant in countries---	All changes in yellow highlights in page 8
Reviewer 1 12)	The sentence of Discussion is too long: "Also, Almatroudi[14] in his large epidemiological study of CRC in Saudi Arabia, showed that there is marked increasing incidence of CRC from 2006 to 2016 attributing that for the large scale screening program that increased the case detection rate and the change towards more unhealthy life styles with higher incidence in big cities like the regions of Riyadh, Makkah, and Eastern Province where westernized life style and flourishing	We did the correction. We separate this long sentence into 2 sentences.	All changes in yellow highlights in page 8

	industries are more evident" Please rewrite it or use a full stop somewhere in the middle. Also, "attributing that for" should probably be "attributing TO", as far as I am concerned.		
Reviewer 1 13)	The last paragraph of Discussion: "The persistence rising trend" <-- could it be changed to something else for better understanding?	We did the correction. The rising trend of CRC despite of the screening programs adopted in many countries was disappointing.	All changes in yellow highlights in page 8
14)	The last paragraph of Discussion: the sentence "This was justified in part by the favorable outcomes of screening and decline in incidence in older age groups were not able to overcome the rising incidence of CRC in younger population" contains many "in". How about changing it to "This PARTLY JUSTIFIED by the favorable outcomes of screening and decline in INCIDENCE WITHIN older age groups were not able to overcome the rising incidence of CRC in younger population"?	We did the correction This was partly justified by the favorable outcomes of screening and decline in incidence within older age groups----	All changes in yellow highlights in page 8
Reviewer 1 15)	The last paragraph of Discussion: "CRC screening in UAE from 2012 through 2019 demonstrated" could be changed to "CRC screening in UAE from 2012 to 2019, which demonstrated", for better understanding.	We did the correction	All changes in yellow highlights in page 8
Reviewer 1 16)	Table is very illegible. I suspect this is due to pasting it to Word document and the fact that many details are provided there with many columns which are too packed to present data clearly. Obviously this can be fixed during production	Yes sir, you are right the unclear table data are due to the too many columns, however, it can be clearly seen in web layout mode of the word document. Yes, it can be easily edited in production.	

	process.		
Reviewer 1 16) cont.	I also noticed few completely empty parts of table, is this intended? Maybe some "no data" in italics will be suitable? I saw that there is such term in specific part of table, but not in others. This should be standardized	Yes, it was intended as such data were not present in the corresponding articles. However, they were corrected to <i>no data as you want</i> .	Have a look on corrected table 1 with new changes in yellow highlights
Reviewer 1 17)	Figure 1 could be misleading sometimes. I think that arrows with excluded records should be located a single level higher (there are two such cases; I mean the arrows directed to the right, with n=1,674 and n=1,327 cases). In other words, if you exclude 1674 out of 3299 records which yields 1625 records, in my opinion the 1674 should be on the level of 3299, not 1625. The same applies to 1327 on the level of 298 - this should be on the level of 1625.	We did this correction	Have a look on Figure 1 in revised manuscript
Reviewer 1 18)	it is recommended to undergo multi-center prospective studies". Can Authors perform such multi-center study/trial in the future?	It is best for such studies to be conducted by governmental collaboration of health-related authorities of related countries, however, we will do our best to conduct and encourage such an important large multi-center multinational study.	
Reviewer 2 comments and authors' responses			
Reviewer 2	The authors should compare the prevalence rates with other rates from the world. Refer to: I. Păun, V. D. Constantin, B. Socea, S. Bobic. The impact of environmental factors upon the incidence rate of colorectal cancer. <i>Ciencia e Técnica Vitivinícola</i> , 2015, 30/2 (11): 99-133.	-We did this in the discussion -in discussion a sentence about CRC in Europe with 2 references was added and one of them according to your recommendation See reference 15,16	The new changes in yellow highlights in discussion and reference section Page 7, 13
	The authors should precise the limits of the study.	We did this at the end of our discussion LIMITATION OF OUR	All changes in yellow highlights

		STUDY Our study has some limitations: The few numbers of studies that met our inclusion criteria, many Arab countries are not represented due to the lack of suitable studies to our review, there were no enough data to answer some logic questions as regional differences of prevalence, epidemiology and risk factors of CRC in Arab countries and the lack of programmed screening and/or surveillance strategy for CRC in most of Arab countries.	Page 8,9
Reviewer 3 comments and authors' responses			
Reviewer 3	None other than language improvement.	Thank you for your comment. We did this in revised manuscript We Sent the manuscript for English Editing by Native English Speakers	See Uploaded New Certificate for English Editing of revised manuscript This certificate was issued on August 5, 2021 and may be verified on the AJE website using the verification code 2364-6709-9285-6D7D-B961 .
EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS and authors, responses			
(1) Science editor:	The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor	We only have one figure that is PRISMA flow diagram of included studies and all required data are included within it. However, we added an extra ppt file contains the PRISMA flow diagram as you ordered	Page 24
(1) Science editor: 5 issues raised			
(1)	The "Author Contributions"	It is present in page 3 of	All changes in

	section is missing.	manuscript.	yellow highlights
(2)	The authors did not provide original pictures. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor	We provided Prisma flow chart in power point also in addition to its presence in manuscript	Have a look on Uploaded figure 1
(3)	PMID numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We added PMID and DOI citation numbers in the revised manuscript. - all references are written using endnote format of WJG downloaded from clarivate website 	
(4)	Article highlights missing	We wrote it just before reference section	All changes in yellow highlights page 10, 11
5)	The manuscript requires English Editing	English editing was done	See Uploaded New Certificate for English Editing of revised manuscript This certificate was issued on August 5, 2021 and may be verified on the AJE website using the verification code 2364-6709-9285-6D7D-B961 .
(2) Company editor-in-chief:	I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision	Thank you for your comment	

	according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.		
--	---	--	--