

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 45872

Title: Efficacy and complications of argon plasma coagulation for hemorrhagic chronic radiation proctitis

Reviewer's code: 00724436

Reviewer's country: France

Science editor: Ruo-Yu Ma

Date sent for review: 2019-01-28

Date reviewed: 2019-02-07

Review time: 9 Hours, 10 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors report the long term results of the treatment by Argon plasma coagulation for chronic radiation proctitis. The title is clear, and each section from the abstract to the discussion reads well. The reference section is up-to-date and the English is fair.



**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

The paper is well illustrated and the tables are clear. The originality of the paper is low, since several prospective and larger studies have been published on the topic for the last 20 years. However, the specificity of this work is the high prevalence of severe cases, with as much as 8 patients out of the 52 treated with surgery or formalin before APC, a mean Hb of 10g/dL, and a fourth of all patients with large rectal ulcers. Furthermore, the high complication rate is also unusual, and also possibly explained by the initial severity of the patient population. The authors chose a stringent endpoint (clinical efficacy maintained for over 12 months) explaining the 69% success rate: this point is well explained in the discussion. The patient number (n= 45) is comparable to other published works on this topic. A few minor points should be clarified: The high prevalence of ulcers is unusual: possible explanations should be discussed. Is it possible that the ulcers were post APC ulcers, or was it a severity feature of the radiation proctitis? The APC mode should be specified. The PCF is a pediatric colonoscope and not a standard colonoscope. PEG based bowel preparation is recommended before APC. The fact that some patients were prepared only with enema should be omitted. A conclusion sentence is missing.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title



**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>

[] Duplicate publication

[] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 45872

Title: Efficacy and complications of argon plasma coagulation for hemorrhagic chronic radiation proctitis

Reviewer's code: 00503883

Reviewer's country: Brazil

Science editor: Ruo-Yu Ma

Date sent for review: 2019-01-28

Date reviewed: 2019-02-10

Review time: 20 Hours, 13 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

That is an interesting issue. I just have some concerns about study method. The volume of PEG solution preparation was not described and neither how many patients were submitted of rectal enemas. The success rate of procedures was low (68,9%) when



**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

compared to medical literature (79%-100%). There was also a high rate of severe complications (13,3% of patients). We could consider patients of this study had more severe chronic radiation proctitis and were previously treated with various topics agents. But also these results were probably related to inadequate endoscopic technique: excessive argon flow or high power and contact of the probe within the rectal mucosa. The authors used a too wide range of argon flow of 1-3 L/min and probably most of them were submitted to high argon flow near to 3 L/min.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No