

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 32621

Title: Multicenter Randomised Controlled Trial comparing HD-WLE and bright NBI for colon polyps

Reviewer's code: 01047625

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-01-19

Date reviewed: 2017-02-12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input 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"/> 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

This manuscript describes a multi-center randomized controlled trial comparing HD-WLE and bright NBI for the detection of colonic polyps. The topic is important and the study design is good with an adequate sample size.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 32621

Title: Multicenter Randomised Controlled Trial comparing HD-WLE and bright NBI for colon polyps

Reviewer's code: 02954069

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-02-21

Date reviewed: 2017-02-28

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input 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

The authors compared ADR of two different modalities. They found that HD-WLE had higher ADR after adjustment of withdrawal time. bNBI had satisfactory negative predictive value in differentiating adenomatous from non-adenomatous histology in diminutive polyps, which was above the PIVI threshold. The paper is well written. I think that there are some points that should be clarified. 1. Endoscopists identified some of the polyps during insertion by using HD-WLE. Therefore they were not blind to polyps during withdrawal. I think that it would be better if a different endoscopist withdrew the endoscope after reaching the cecum. 2. What were the standard positions during withdrawal of the endoscope? 3. Were there any differences in the suggested surveillance intervals based on the findings of HD-WLE and b-NBI? 4. Were there any differences between the ADR of HD-WLE and b-NBI in specific locations such as right colon?