



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** office@baishideng.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 112038

**Title:** Analysis of antinuclear antibody pattern distribution and correlation in patients with colorectal cancer

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 08396804

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree and professional title:** PhD

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Brazil

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2025-08-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Editor

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2025-08-26 10:33

**Reviewer performed review:** 2025-09-15 01:06

**Review time:** 19 Days and 14 Hours

<b>Content to be reviewed</b>	Does the manuscript's content fall within the scope of the journal? <b>Yes</b> Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? <b>Yes</b> Do authors' affiliations correspond to the content of the manuscript? <b>Yes</b> Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? <b>Yes</b> Are the Key Words complete? <b>Yes</b>
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



# Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** office@baishideng.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

Is the content of the Introduction adequate? **Yes**

Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete?

**Yes**

Are the experimental data presented in the manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? **Yes**

Are the quality and resolution of the images up to standard? **Yes**

Is the description of the experiments clear and complete? **Yes**

Are the experimental data of the Results true and reliable? **Yes**

Do the selection and design of the figures and tables follow the principles of necessity and clarity? **Yes**

Is there any duplication between various parts of the manuscript and between the main text and the content presented in the figures and tables? **No**

Are the figures and tables numbered consecutively in the order in which they appear in the manuscript? **Yes**

Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? **Yes**

Is the Conclusion reasonable? **Yes**

Do authors omit important references? **No**

Are all references necessary and reasonable? **Yes**

Are all references related to the topic of the manuscript? **Yes**

Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? **No**

Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? **Yes**

Will the manuscript's content be of interest to readers?  
**Yes**

Are additional experiments needed for the study? **No**

Does the research scope comply with ethics? **Yes**



Scientific quality	Grade B (Very good)
Novelty of this manuscript	Grade C (Good)
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	Grade C (Good)
Language quality	Grade C (Good)
Does this manuscript describe a study of the existing knowledge system?	Yes
Does this manuscript report a revolutionary innovation?	No
Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?	No
Conclusion	Minor revision
Re-review	No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No
Are your review comments generated by AI tools?	No

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Thank you for inviting me to review “Analysis of ANA Patterns Distribution and Correlation in Patients With Colorectal Cancer” by Liang et al. This study is an interesting study on the distribution and correlation analysis of ANA types in patients with colorectal cancer. The authors further explored the potential of ANA for colorectal cancer screening by analyzing the correlation between ANA and colorectal cancer. Overall, the study was well designed and the results were highly significant. We recommend acceptance of this study with minor modifications. 1. The abstract fully



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** office@baishideng.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

summarizes the objectives, methods, results, and conclusions of this study, but does not provide the background on the relationship between ANA and colorectal cancer. Please summarize and elaborate on this. 2. The sentence "To detect the fluorescent patterns distribution of antinuclear antibody...; To preliminarily investigate the correlation between ANA...of CRC screening" is too long and includes multiple objectives, making it difficult to read. Please revise the sentence structure to significantly improve the rigor and readability of the text. 3. The results in the abstract are too long; please simplify the sentences appropriately. 4. How is the specific data supporting the statement "Only the colorectal cancer primary diagnosed group expressed high titer"? 5. The authors introduce the background of colorectal cancer, the relationship between ANA and colorectal cancer, and the key parameters (fluorescence pattern) for detecting ANA results. The clinical value of ANA testing lies in its titer (concentration/quantity) and fluorescence pattern. The purpose of this study is logically stated. However, the background on the current relationship between ANA and colorectal cancer is limited, and additional information is recommended. 6. The authors have detailed the inclusion and exclusion criteria and the experimental methods, but please confirm that the formatting of the numbers "①②③" is correct. 7 For Table 4, supplement with 1:100, 1:320, and 1:1000.