



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 35418

Title: Post-Endoscopic Procedure Satisfaction Scores: Can We Improve?

Reviewer's code: 02575643

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-08-07

Date reviewed: 2017-08-07

| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | [Y] 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

I encourage the Authors to modifies the study to avoid possible statistical criticisms.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 35418

Title: Post-Endoscopic Procedure Satisfaction Scores: Can We Improve?

Reviewer’s code: 00068723

Reviewer’s country: Japan

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-08-07

Date reviewed: 2017-08-08

| 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 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 checked="" 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 investigated factors affecting satisfaction of endoscopic procedures. They concluded that duration of endoscopy affected the patient satisfaction, and the duration was related with age. The conclusion was interesting and rationale. One major problem was that the patient group was consisted of various kinds of procedures as shown in Table 3. It was assumed that invasiveness depended on the procedures. For example, invasiveness seemed different between colonoscopy and EGD. The different invasiveness might affect the patient satisfaction. This point should be discussed in Discussion. Aim of Table 4 was not clear. The title says, "Relationship". But no data is seen regarding relationship, such as ANOVA.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 35418

Title: Post-Endoscopic Procedure Satisfaction Scores: Can We Improve?

Reviewer’s code: 00071703

Reviewer’s country: Turkey

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-08-07

Date reviewed: 2017-08-12

| 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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| | | 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

Post-Endoscopic Procedure Satisfaction Scores: Can We Improve? In this retrospective study, the authors aimed to organize the post-procedure satisfaction data into a useful reference as well as analyze various patient-centered parameters to find trends that might influence the overall outcome and lead to process improvements in order to optimize the patient experience. A database of two cohorts of outpatients that underwent endoscopic procedures at Georgetown University Hospital was included in the study. With the addition of post-procedure calls, the response rate was 40.5% in the study. There was a statistically significant improved response rate pre and post intervention. Upon analysis of patient-related variables, there was also a statistically significant relationship that was seen between age and procedure length. The authors have concluded that calling patients after they undergo endoscopy can drastically improve post procedure satisfaction response rates. This study is an interesting work that can be published with minor improvements. Table 4 should be combined with table



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

6, also table 5 with table 7.