

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 61383

**Title:** Impact of type 2 diabetes on adenoma detection in screening colonoscopies performed in disparate populations

**Reviewer's code:** 00068723

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Occupational Physician

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-12-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-12-05 07:45

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-12-05 08:29

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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 checked="" 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**

The authors investigated the background of patient with colorectal adenoma diagnosed with colonoscopy. They found out that type 2 diabetes (T2DM) correlated with colorectal adenoma. The study population was rationale because it was from screening colonoscopy, and free from bias due to abdominal diseases with symptoms. One major problem was that age cofounded the results. As age grows, number of patients with T2DM increases. At the same time, the number of patients with colorectal adenoma increases. How would the authors control this phenomenon? Table 5. All colonic neoplastic lesions had strongest significance. But adenoma only showed less significance. Lesions other than adenoma showed no significance. All colonic neoplastic lesions contain adenoma and the other lesions. Therefore, all colonic neoplastic lesion should have shown less significance as compared with adenoma only. How would the authors address this potential problem? Table 7. Age, BMI, Sex, and smoking had stronger significance as compared with T2DM. The title of this manuscript features diabetes. How did the authors choose T2DM? Abstract. ADR should be spelled out when it first appeared.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 61383

**Title:** Impact of type 2 diabetes on adenoma detection in screening colonoscopies performed in disparate populations

**Reviewer's code:** 05085943

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-12-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-12-08 02:59

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-12-11 08:58

**Review time:** 3 Days and 5 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<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 checked="" 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**

1. Table3 The number of patients recorded about family history of CRC in a first degree relative was too small. The data did not reflect the patient's background and should be excluded from analysis. 2. There was a significant increased risk of adenomas in T2DM than control group. However, there was no significant difference in the rate of advanced adenoma and high-risk adenoma that may be more associated with CRC. Please discuss this result. 3. The NoDM patients were classified as PreDM and control, and ADR was significantly higher in T2DM than control. Please show the results of T2DM vs PreDM and PreDM vs control. 4. The findings of Table6 and Table7 were the results from combined data set. Because that were data combined from different institution and physician, it should be added as limitation that there was a selection bias.