

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 54435

**Title:** Optical imaging technology in colonoscopy: Is there a role for photometric stereo?

**Reviewer's code:** 00033055

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** United Kingdom

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-01-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-02-02 17:16

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-02-08 18:15

**Review time:** 6 Days

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

In the present paper two completely different sections can be recognized: the first one represents a systematic overview on the several optical imaging technologies introduced to enhance topographic contrast and to facilitate the detection of adenomas; the second one is the description of the photometric stereo technology and its potential use in colonoscopy. Theoretically, the first part would introduce the second one which is likely to be most important one in the paper. Actually, the two parts appear to be completely different and is difficult to understand the connections between them. The description of the photometric stereo technology is very interesting and clear. The technology is new for endoscopists and because of this the paper could be of extreme interest for the readers. I feel, however, that the paper is lacking of figures and schemes and because of this it is likely to be quite difficult for the readers to understand exactly the possible use of the technology in endoscopy. I would suggest the authors to provide a couple of images regarding the in vitro and animal studies to show how the colon surface and polyps would appear. Moreover, some schemes showing how the technology works and how the images are created would be welcome. I would suggest the authors also to remove the first part of the study, the part managing the conventional imaging technology, and to widen the part regarding the photometric stereo technology.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 54435

**Title:** Optical imaging technology in colonoscopy: Is there a role for photometric stereo?

**Reviewer's code:** 03667297

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MBBS, MD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** India

**Author's Country/Territory:** United Kingdom

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-01-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ying Dou

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-03-25 16:21

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-03-25 16:42

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well written manuscript. But there is no image in the manuscript. Images would have enhanced the impact of manuscript. Should have mentioned the role of these technologies in colorectal cancer screening.