



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 54084

Title: Effectiveness of very low-volume preparation for colonoscopy: A prospective, multicenter observational study

Reviewer’s code: 03478404

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Romania

Author’s Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2020-01-10

Reviewer chosen by: Ruo-Yu Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-02-17 12:07

Reviewer performed review: 2020-02-20 15:00

Review time: 3 Days and 2 Hours

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The original research entitled “Effectiveness of very low-volume preparation for colonoscopy: a prospective, multicenter observational study” represents a very useful manuscript for gastroenterologists and, implicitly, their patients. Its originality comes from presenting, for the first time, the results of a real-life study setting. A big bonus is the large number of patients, from five centres, enrolled prospectively. Results showed the high effectiveness and tolerability of very low-volume preparation (1-L PEG-ASC) for colonoscopy as compared with a 2-L and 4-L preparations. By using a lower-volume solution for bowel cleansing is expected that more patients will accept colonoscopy, therefore with huge health benefits, both at individual and general level, on the health care system costs, since early detection is always better. In the whole manuscript, the authors paid much attention to details, which is much appreciated. Title and Key abstract are well chosen. Abstract, Core tip and Introduction contain accurate data, easily to be followed and understood. Minor comments/suggestions: 1. Introduction: a. Please define NER 1006 (as “1L polyethylene glycol plus ascorbate”), before using the abbreviation. b. Please decide whether you use NER1006 or PEG-ASC (the latter being more used in your manuscript), in order to avoid confusion for readers. 2. Methods: well explained. Suggestion – please write separate paragraphs for design, patients inclusion and exclusion criteria), techniques and statistics. 3. Results: Both text and tables & figures are clearly presented and of good quality. a. Tables 1, 2 and 3: Please explain (under the table) the abbreviations PEG-ELS and PEG-ASC. b. After the sentences “With regard to the preparation regimen, 62.5% of patients performed an afternoon-only and 37.5% an afternoon-morning (split) preparation. The mean time between the assumption of the last dose and the beginning of the colonoscopy was 11.9 ± 2.8 and 4.9 ± 1.8 hours in the two groups, respectively.”, please mention how many in each of the three groups.



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

This could be of paramount importance when interpreting the results. This particular instance is not mentioned in Table 1. c. Later on, in the results, the authors wrote “When assessed by preparation modality, cleansing success was 68.1%, 65.6% and 83.3% (p=0.065 for 1L vs. 2L; p= 0.069 for 1L vs. 4L) for afternoon-only preparation and 90.3%, 88.3% and 91.9% (p=0.84 for 1L vs. 2L; p=0.84 for 1L vs. 4L) for split preparation in the three groups, respectively”. Therefore, there was no significant difference between the 3 regimens. This should be highlighted. d. Results also showed that cleansing success was significantly better only with the 1-L vs the 2-L, in the afternoon-morning regimen. No other significant differences were found, even with the 4-L subgroup. No difference at all in the afternoon-only preparation. The cleansing success rates are overall low. How do the authors explain these results? e. Figures 1 (a to e), 2 and 3: Please explain the abbreviations PEG-ELS and PEG-ASC. f. Paragraph “Predictors of cleansing success and high-quality cleansing of the right colon”: f1. First sentence - “The logistic multiple regression model” - please insert “for overall cleansing success”. f2. Next sentence: “The logistic multiple regression model” - please insert “for high-quality cleansing of the right colon. g. Paragraph “Adherence and tolerability” - There was no significant difference between the 3 subgroups; therefore writing that “Adherence was also higher in the group of patients assuming the 1L-PEG” is not correct. h. Tolerability - “Figure 3 b” should be inserted in the text after the sentence “tolerability was higher for the 1L preparation compared to the 2 and 4L-PEG solutions, with an average score of 7.9±1.3 vs. 7.1±2.0 and 7.3±1.9 (p<0.001 for 1L vs. 2L; p<0.001 for 1L vs. 4L)” and deleted from where the authors mentioned it, as it is not correct. i. Supplementary Table 1 and text regarding Safety: How do the authors interpret the highest incidence of vomiting in the 1-L preparation group? It is too briefly mentioned in Discussion. But, vomiting should affect tolerability. Therefore? j. Supplementary Table 1. Please write the abbreviations TEAEs, PEG-ASC and PEG-ELS under the table. 4. Discussion: a. What do the authors



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

mean by “In attrition, the combination of 1L-PEG solution and of a split regimen..”?
Does not make any sense! b. Strength and limitations of the study were well presented in
the Discussion. 5. Format of the style requested by the journal, including references is
not adequate.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 54084

Title: Effectiveness of very low-volume preparation for colonoscopy: a prospective, multicenter observational study

Reviewer's code: 03478404

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Romania

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2020-01-10

Reviewer chosen by: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-03-30 07:24

Reviewer performed review: 2020-03-30 08:19

Review time: 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The revised version of the manuscript appears much better. I am pleased that the authors corrected the manuscript according to the reviewer's suggestions (in all sections of the paper, including Tables and Figures). It is very useful that the authors added also the "Article Highlights" paragraph. I consider the manuscript as fulfilling the qualities and criteria in order to be published in the World Journal of Gastroenterology. Congratulations to the authors! Just some (very) minor comments: 1. The requested format was still not respected: "All articles must be prepared with Word-processing Software, using 12 pt Book Antiqua font and 1.5 line spacing with ample margins." The manuscript was written in Arial. However, this is a (very) minor issue. 2. The short (running) title is missing. It should be added.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No