



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



**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

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
- 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: 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



**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

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