

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 59941

Title: Noninferiority clinical trial comparing the bowel cleansing efficacy of sodium phosphate tablets (Quiklean®) with a polyethylene glycol/Bisacodyl kit

Reviewer's code: 00008652

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FRACP, FRCP, MBBS, MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Singapore

Author's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Manuscript submission date: 2020-11-05

Reviewer chosen by: Le Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-02 01:47

Reviewer performed review: 2020-12-07 14:02

Review time: 5 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" 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

The study is well designed and manuscript well written. I have several comments to make:- 1. The hypokalemia experienced by the patients after Quiklesan preparation is of concern. The minimal level reported was 2.3! This had not been emphasized in both the results section and the discussion section. 2. There was no mention of the reason for some patients who were screened but not randomized for the study. 3. The manuscript has included too many tables. Reading would be made easier if the content of some of the tables can be included in the text instead.