

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 54799

Title: Efficacy of various endoscopic modalities in detecting dysplasia in ulcerative colitis: A systematic review and network meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 03666697

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2020-02-18

Reviewer chosen by: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-02-24 13:31

Reviewer performed review: 2020-03-08 07:56

Review time: 12 Days and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

This systematic review and network meta-analysis reported the rate of dysplasia per biopsy and per patient among four different endoscopic methods (WL SD, WL HD, CE HD, and NBI HD), as well as the number of dysplasia per patient. The manuscript is well written. However, there are some comments to the authors. 1. The word "neoplasia" in the title may have to be replaced with "dysplasia" to reflect the focus of the report on the manuscript. 2. Did the dysplasia in this study include low-grade or high-grade dysplasia, or both? This must be stated in the manuscript. 3. Many hospitals may not have high-definition endoscopic equipment. In this case, CE/NBI may be an option to improve the diagnosis rate. Therefore, why didn't the authors include CE SD or NBI SD in this network meta-analysis? 4. A major mistake: this study included 7 RCTs and cited them as references 33-43. However, references 33-43 were the studies reporting on eosinophilic esophagitis. 5. A minor mistake: In "Comparison of dysplasia detection rates per biopsy" section, the first sentence "A shown in Supplementary Figure 1A" should be corrected.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 54799

Title: Efficacy of various endoscopic modalities in detecting dysplasia in ulcerative colitis: A systematic review and network meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 05272457

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree:

Professional title:

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2020-02-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-02-19 16:24

Reviewer performed review: 2020-03-10 04:52

Review time: 19 Days and 12 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous 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 article titled "Efficacy of various endoscopic modalities in detecting neoplasia in ulcerative colitis: a systematic review and network meta-analysis" is a well-written article which compared the efficacy of WL SD, WL HD, NBI HD, and CE HD in detecting dysplasia in UC through systematic review. The original finding of this article is "WL SD was inferior in detecting dysplasia in UC" when compared with WL HD, NBI HD, and CE HD. In the discussion part, it should be figured out not only the direction of associated research but the future clinical directions of the topic described in this field.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 54799

Title: Efficacy of various endoscopic modalities in detecting dysplasia in ulcerative colitis: A systematic review and network meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 03666697

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2020-02-18

Reviewer chosen by: Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-04-27 14:02

Reviewer performed review: 2020-04-29 14:08

Review time: 2 Days

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	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
https://www.wjgnet.com

The revised manuscript is fine. This systematic review and network meta-analysis can help endoscopists choose a more appropriate way to monitor dysplasia in UC patients.