



**ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 23288

**Title:** The Application of Robotics in Gastrointestinal Endoscopy - a Review

**Reviewer’s code:** 00183658

**Reviewer’s country:** Thailand

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-11-09 08:35

**Date reviewed:** 2015-11-13 13:13

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The article is aimed to assess the current status of robotic flexible endoscopic platforms designed for advanced endolumenal procedures. The title is “The Application of Robotics in Gastrointestinal Endoscopy - a Review”. 1. Unfortunately, the authors did not show the cost-effectiveness of the robotics. 2. It might be a valuable review if the authors also summarize these details into the “Table”. 3. Finally, the authors should to recommend the readers “How to apply this knowledge for clinical practice?”

**Response**

Thank you very much for the constructive comments. The reviewed systems are mostly preclinical or in early clinical trial. As such, no data is available on their cost effectiveness. Table 1 has been changed in order to highlight the stage of development of the various systems. The discussion of the paper has been changed significantly to highlight the clinical applicability of the systems reviewed in the article.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 23288

**Title:** The Application of Robotics in Gastrointestinal Endoscopy - a Review

**Reviewer's code:** 02441722

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-11-09 08:35

**Date reviewed:** 2015-11-14 12:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Title: Application of robotics in gastrointestinal endoscopy-a review. The authors indicated a current review of the robotic flexible endoscope platforms. This manuscript is very interesting and well written. However, I feel there are some problems in this article. (1) Results and Discussion are very interesting. However, they are slightly rambling talk in each paragraph. The author should change these paragraphs more compact and brief. (2) Author should indicate a figure legend of Figure 1. (3) Author should add the "(Figure 4)" in the paragraph of Neoguide. (4) Author should add the "(Figure 7)" in the paragraph of CUHK double balloon endoscope. (5) Author should indicate a figure legend of Figure 8. (6) Author should add the "(Figure 14)" in the paragraph of Other prototypes.

### Response

Thank you very much for the helpful comments to improve the article. The results and discussion section has been altered significantly to improve its succinctness, coherence of thought, organization and readability. References to various figures within the article has been added to the text.



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---