



**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>

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 54503

**Title:** Retrograde inspection vs standard forward view for the detection of colorectal adenomas during colonoscopy: A back-to-back randomized clinical trial

**Reviewer's code:** 00503623

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

**Author's Country/Territory:** Germany

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-02-03

**Reviewer chosen by:** Le Zhang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-02-13 18:04

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-02-13 19:08

**Review time:** 1 Hour

| SCIENTIFIC QUALITY                                     | LANGUAGE QUALITY  | CONCLUSION                                 | PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS                      |
|--|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent            | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing       | <input checked="" 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 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**

This manuscript, No. 54503, examines the possible advantage of retrograde inspection (RFV) over that of standard forward view (SFV) in the detection of colorectal adenomas during colonoscopy. The results obtained with 205 patients revealed that majority of adenomas found during second inspection in RFV or in SFV were in the transverse and left-side colon. However, no difference between SFV and RFV was found in the increased adenoma detection rate, thus suggesting that increased detection rate of adenoma is most likely due to the second inspection itself and not the inspection mode. Therefore, it is suggested that second inspection of the colon should be considered as a feasible approach to increase ADR and effectiveness of colonoscopy procedure.

## **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 Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 54503

**Title:** Retrograde inspection vs standard forward view for the detection of colorectal adenomas during colonoscopy: A back-to-back randomized clinical trial

**Reviewer's code:** 02839880

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Full Professor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** Germany

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-02-03

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-02-03 14:58

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-02-13 21:45

**Review time:** 10 Days and 6 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        |

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is an interesting study that aimed to assess whether inspection of the whole colon in retroflected view compared to standard forward view can increase Adenoma Detection Rate. In general, the manuscript is well written; please check throughout the text for grammar and spelling errors. Methods section is clear and statistical analysis was well conducted. Please add the meaning of acronyms in the figures legends. Please check Table 2 as the structure of the table is not clear. It would be interesting to add a brief discussion on the role of CRP levels and advanced colorectal adenoma risk, and if this assessment could be associated to endoscopic examination to improve diagnosis (Godis J et al, World J Gastroenterol. 2017). Finally, I would include further discussion in the conclusion paragraph on the future direction and possible application of the results.

## **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

### ***Google Search:***

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

### ***BPG Search:***

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

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 54503

**Title:** Retrograde inspection vs standard forward view for the detection of colorectal adenomas during colonoscopy: A back-to-back randomized clinical trial

**Reviewer's code:** 03442051

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** BM BCh

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** Germany

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-02-03

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-02-04 22:15

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-02-23 22:25

**Review time:** 19 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 type="checkbox"/> Anonymous           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | polishing   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept | <input checked="" 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**

Well conducted study and good data presentation. There is a room for improvement, I have corrected some spelling errors. I have noted the abbreviations were misspelled especially "RFV". I have noticed and highlighted a point in the discussion section which needs further clarity regarding 7 to 10 percent increase in ADR with second attempt of colonoscopy either with SFV or RFV. Have you thought about inter observer difference in the ADR between the different endoscopists using 'kappa' statistics. Would you be able to perform this statistical test to see if any difference in both arms using kappa statistic as a measure of inter observer/ rater difference with different endoscopists. I do note that there is a scope for improvement if you do statistical modelling using 'Kappa statistic'

## **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:** 54503

**Title:** Retrograde inspection vs standard forward view for the detection of colorectal adenomas during colonoscopy: A back-to-back randomized clinical trial

**Reviewer's code:** 02839880

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Full Professor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** Germany

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-02-03

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yu-Qiao Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-04-04 20:52

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-04-06 14:46

**Review time:** 1 Day and 17 Hours

| 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 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        |



**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**

Many thanks, the comments have been addressed satisfactorily.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

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

##### ***BPG Search:***

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