

## Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS



February 22, 2014

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 8099-review.doc).

**Title:** Randomized controlled trial of sodium phosphate tablets versus PEG solution for colonoscopy bowel cleansing

**Author:** Yoon Suk Jung, Chang Kyun Lee, Hyo Jong Kim, Chang Soo Eun, Dong Soo Han, Dong Il Park

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8099

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

1 Format has been updated

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer

### **(1) Reviewer A**

The paper reports a study by Yoon Suk Junget al. comparing NaP (sodium phosphate anhydrous/monohydrate) tablets versus standard polyethylene glycol solution for bowel cleansing before screening colonoscopy.

The paper is well written but some criticisms may be made.

As the same Authors claim in Discussion, an important point when a phosphate-based preparation is used for colonoscopy is the possible occurrence of electrolytic changes which may lead to side effects, sometimes serious, in some patients, such as those affected by cardiovascular diseases, renal impairment and other conditions. In order to limit the occurrence of serious adverse events, study population excluded patients with known or possibly having (aged >60) risky conditions as well as inpatients, due to comorbidities. Thus, data emerging from the investigation refer to a selected population comprising only relatively young (aged <60) healthy subjects undergoing colonoscopy for screening. Correctly, Authors conclude Discussion stating that bowel preparation with NaP tablets is safe, well-tolerated, and efficient in healthy individuals without comorbidity. Authors should also add the relatively young age of patients (<60) in this statement. Features of patients should be added in Abstract, in Patients and Methods defining patients enrolled (aged <60 healthy individuals undergoing morning screening colonoscopy).

**Reply: We added the following phrase in methods of Abstract "the relatively young (19-60 years) healthy outpatients without comorbidity were randomly assigned to one of two arms. All colonoscopy were scheduled in the morning," and added the phrase in conclusion of Abstract "in the relatively young (aged <60) healthy individuals without comorbidity.**

**Also, we added the following sentence in Patients and Methods "We included only the relatively young (aged <60) healthy subjects without comorbidity."**

Taking into account characteristics of study population and the lack of assessment of electrolytic balance before and after bowel preparation, which limits a full information regarding tolerability, Authors should highlight in Discussion that the study setting is adequate to demonstrate that NaP

tablets preparation is effective to determine a good bowel cleansing and is well accepted while does not furnish sufficient data to reach definite conclusions regarding tolerability and safety in general population.

**Reply: As the reviewer pointed out, in our study, renal function and electrolyte level were not monitored after colonoscopy, although they were confirmed to be normal before colonoscopy. However, we excluded patients at risk of renal dysfunction and participants returned to the hospital within 1-2 weeks of their colonoscopy to be assessed for purgatives-related complications. We added these contents in Discussion.**

Minor criticisms

Patients and Methods:

Study population:

- What is the period of study? From December 2012 to October 2013? The sentence is not clear, please modify.

**Reply: We added the following sentence.**

**"Between December 2012 and October 2013, consecutive outpatients aged 19-60 years who were scheduled to undergo routine elective colonoscopy were recruited to this study."**

- What does mean "non specific symptoms"? Do authors mean absence of a known disease, for example an inflammatory bowel disease, or symptoms of alarm (rectal, bleeding, etc.?) Please clarify.

**Reply: We deleted "with nonspecific gastrointestinal symptoms"**

- Bowel preparation: have agents for bowel cleansing been dispensed by research center or prescribed and acquired by patients in form of marketed packages?

**Reply: After patient enrollment and randomization, clinical research coordinators at each participating center directly gave each patient one of two bowel cleansing agents (CLICOLON tablets or 4 L PEG solution). We added the following sentence. "Agents for bowel cleansing were dispensed by clinical research coordinators."**

2.Evaluation of patient compliance, acceptability, satisfaction, and safety: no information is furnished regarding which way the safety has been evaluated or defined: on the basis of serious adverse events?

**Reply: We added the following sentence.**

**"Patients were asked if they had experienced any adverse events (nausea, vomiting, abdominal pain, bloating, anal irritation symptom, or sleep disturbance). "**

Some English (for example, difference instead different in Page 8, line 20, etc.) or typewriting (for example Clicolom instead Clicolon, page 9, line 17) errors have to be corrected in the text.

**Reply: We change to "different" and "CLICOLON"**

## **(2) Reviewer B**

Dr. Jung and others wanted to compare the bowel cleansing efficacy of newer formulation of NaP tablets (COLICOLON) manufactured in Korea claimed to be smaller, lighter and disintegrate more quickly than US FDA approved Osmoprep tablets , to PEG solution using a none inferiority randomized study design. Authors found equal efficacy between the two regimens with regards to bowel cleansing but NaP tablets to be better tolerated and preferred. - This study didn't add any new knowledge, multiple studies and multiple meta-analyses have shown the same exact result. Yes Nap is as effective as 4L PEG solution and better tolerated but its use is limited by the side

effects and its recommended to be used as an alternative to PEG solution in carefully selected group of people (young, healthy with no co morbidities) which is exactly what this study showed.

**Reply: Although several previous studies have shown the similar results, CLICOLON tablet is the first Korean NaP tablets for bowel cleansing and this study is the first Korean trial to compare the efficacy of NaP tablets and 4 L PEG solution for bowel preparation in controlled circumstances.**

**(3) Reviewer C**

Dear Authors Thanks for sending the manuscript "Randomized controlled trial of sodium phosphate tablets versus PEG solution for colonoscopy bowel cleansing "for revision -Idea of the paper repeatedly done in search work. - well written - figure and tables are well organized

**Reply: Thank you for the compliment.**

3 References and typesetting were corrected

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Sincerely yours,

Dong Il, Park, MD, PhD  
Department of Internal Medicine  
Kangbuk Samsung Hospital  
Sungkyunkwan University School of Medicine  
108, Pyung-Dong, Jongro-Ku, Seoul, Korea 110-746  
Phone: +82-2-2001-2059, Fax: +82-2-2001-2049  
E-mail: diksmc.park@samsung.com