PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 46777

Title: Higher dose of simethicone decreases colonic bubbles and increases prep tolerance and quality of bowel prep: Meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Reviewer's code: 02453249

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-02-23 09:34

Reviewer performed review: 2019-02-28 08:28

Review time: 4 Days and 22 Hours

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[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The Authors aimed to encompass recent randomized controlled trials in a meta-analysis to assess the effect of simethicone on bowel preparation, ADR, and patient compliance. Comments   -The Authors should pre-specified objectives and methods, and reported

the results in accordance with the PRISMA statement. (Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG; PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. PLoS Med 2009) -The Authors should provide a full search strategy. -Figure 1 should follow the Prisma draft, with the complete literature search scheme and the reasons of exclusion of articles. Accounting for the trials that were not selected and the reasons for their exclusion is as important as accounting for the trials that were selected. - The authors should clarify the primary outcome (e.g. parameters of inadequate bowel preparation). Outcome definition is particular problem for meta-analyses that rely exclusively on published trial data. Information taken from published articles about the component trials may be incomplete or lack specificity. Publications may not report outcome of interest, and even when the outcome is reported, important details may be lacking. - I would suggest use the Deek's method to assess publication bias in Funnel plot analysis. The authors did not report the values of bias, standard error and p-value. Moreover, they should implement the figure legend. The validity of a meta-analysis depends on minimizing bias in the identification of studies; otherwise the conclusions of the analysis can be compromised by publication bias. - The Authors should provide a table with the characteristics of patients included in the meta-analysis.   - The Authors should clarify and better explain the results of sensitivity analysis regarding simethicone dose. Sensitivity analyses play an important role in examining the impact of meta-analysis design decisions on the findings as well as the strength of evidence provided by the meta-analysis. The goal of any sensitivity analysis should not be to search for additional findings, but to support and understand the primary findings of the meta-analysis. - Another issue is that different dose, mode and timing administration of simethicone reported in the studies evaluated can led to a reasonable bias in the results of meta-analysis.   - Beside the sensitivity analysis performed, the Authors should conduct a meta-regression analysis to evaluate the

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

impact of moderator variables on the results. (e.g. rate of women or patients with previous colorectal cancer) - The Authors should provide (maybe in the supplementary materials) the forest plots regarding the analysis of patient compliance. (e.g. nausea, vomiting) - In the Forest Plots the Authors should replace "Forrest" with "Forest" and they should implement the figure legend. - The assertion "We feel that simethicone as a colonoscopy adjuvant is currently underutilized by gastroenterologists worldwide" requires further deepening.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 46777

Title: Higher dose of simethicone decreases colonic bubbles and increases prep tolerance and quality of bowel prep: Meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Reviewer's code: 03491812

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-02-22 07:17

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-04 03:29

Review time: 9 Days and 20 Hours

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a well-written meta-analysis article. Some minor concerns should be addressed. The publication bias is needed to be tested by Egger Test, not only by funnel plot. In Figure 2, unclear of risk is described by yellow color. But I did not see the yellow in the

bars.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No