

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34783

Title: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS OF COLON CLEANSING PREPARATIONS IN PATIENTS WITH INFLAMMATORY BOWEL DISEASE

Reviewer's code: 01213502

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2017-05-28

Date reviewed: 2017-06-06

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting article that the authors made a study to review and meta-analyze colon cleansing preparations in patients with inflammatory bowel disease IBD. They concluded that in patients without contraindications, low-volume PEG preparation with adjuvants in split-dosing may represent a valid alternative to standard high-volume PEG with at least a similar efficacy and a better acceptability. I agree the methods, results and discussion. However, I have one comment on line 8th of discussion "Severe side effects such as flare of the disease or preparation-induced ulcerations were very rare (<6%)..." I don't agree the term "very rare" here. A study (Qualitative Descriptors of Disease Incidence: Commonly Used and Frequently Muddled) reported by Snowman et al in 2009 to evaluate the use of the terms "frequent," "common," "uncommon," and "rare" in the medical literature and compare their use both within and between two fields of medicine. Although there is different definition qualitatively to discuss disease incidence in the 4 main medical journals, the recent definition of frequency in medicine



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

seems to be that as below: 1.Very common • > 10% 2.Common (frequent) • 1~10%
3.Uncommon (infrequent) • 0.1~1% 4.Rare • 0.01~0.1% 5.Very rare • <0.01% Please
make a correction.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34783

Title: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS OF COLON CLEANSING PREPARATIONS IN PATIENTS WITH INFLAMMATORY BOWEL DISEASE

Reviewer's code: 02467561

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2017-05-28

Date reviewed: 2017-06-09

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

Dear Authors, The manuscript "A systematic review and meta-analysis of colon cleansing preparations in patients with inflammatory bowel disease" is clearly written and well organized. The title reflects the study design and contents of the text, the objective of the study is clearly defined and the study design is appropriate to achieve the objective. The procedures and methods are appropriately described and, despite the limited published data, the study conclusions are justified by the data and analysis. Based on these considerations, I think that the manuscript is eligible for publication.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34783

Title: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS OF COLON CLEANSING PREPARATIONS IN PATIENTS WITH INFLAMMATORY BOWEL DISEASE

Reviewer's code: 02460781

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2017-05-28

Date reviewed: 2017-06-12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The systematic review and meta-analysis was to investigate possible differences in terms of effectiveness, safety and tolerability between existing colon-cleansing products in this population. It has significance for clinical practice. The conclusion in the article was incomplete.