Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 68080

Title: Circulating tumor DNA dynamics analysis in a xenograft mouse model with esophageal squamous cell carcinoma

Reviewer’s code: 04967668

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Slovenia

Author’s Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-28 07:00

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-01 08:33

Review time: 3 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality
[ Y] Grade A: Excellent  [ ] Grade B: Very good  [ ] Grade C: Good
[ ] Grade D: Fair  [ ] Grade E: Do not publish

Language quality
[ Y] Grade A: Priority publishing  [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing
[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing  [ ] Grade D: Rejection

Conclusion
[ ] Accept (High priority)  [ Y] Accept (General priority)
[ ] Minor revision  [ ] Major revision  [ ] Rejection

Re-review
[ ] Yes  [ Y] No

Peer-reviewer statements
Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous  [ ] Onymous
Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes  [ Y] No
SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The authors of the manuscript »Circulating tumor DNA dynamics analysis in a xenograft mouse model« have performed a very interesting study which provides an important additional scientific background for the concept of liquid biopsy. In the short introduction section, they explain the potential clinical benefits as well as current scientific shortcomings of ctDNA based liquid biopsy. In the methods section they provide all the available relevant information regarding their human esophageal squamous cell carcinoma cell line TE11 based mouse model of cancer. All real life scenarios of different stages of cancers as well as consequences of tumor resection are well simulated as well as clearly and methodologically correctly presented. ctDNA based liquid biopsy tumor assessment method is nicely described. All the results are thoroughly and clearly presented. The discussion is objective and fair. The most clinically relevant findings of the study are pointed out and possible limitations of the study are also fairly stressed at the end of the section. The conclusions are straight and sound. The references are relevant; the sources seem reliable.