

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 31908

**Title:** Use of shape-from-shading to characterize mucosal topography in celiac disease videocapsule images

**Reviewer's code:** 03259017

**Reviewer's country:** Canada

**Science editor:** Jin-Xin Kong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-12-16

**Date reviewed:** 2016-12-16

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Probably limited applicability in clinical care, but still interesting. The number of patients with celiac disease (how were these actually diagnosed...initial biopsy and then re-biopsy after gluten free diet?). The use of Marsh criteria, while also interesting, makes further division of the study population difficult to develop any definite conclusions. Nevertheless, the pictures are attractive, including the efforts to provide some form of scientific evaluation on their interpretation. I am not convinced that this manuscript adds a great deal to the literature on celiac disease, especially with small samples sizes, but it is interesting, and therefore, something that the readership might find useful. The author needs to emphasize that the data sample size makes interpretation of the data very difficult.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 31908

**Title:** Use of shape-from-shading to characterize mucosal topography in celiac disease videocapsule images

**Reviewer's code:** 00039306

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Jin-Xin Kong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-12-16

**Date reviewed:** 2016-12-29

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I received the paper reviewed by two previous reviewers along with the response by the authors. I have seen that all the points raised by the reviewers are substantial. Authors acknowledged the points raised by the reviewers and modified accordingly the manuscript. In particular, the new statistical analysis lead to a more scientific than descriptive study. Overall, the quality of the paper has been improved. Nevertheless, the main drawback of the study relies on the validity of the quantitative approach to the shape-from-shading method. Even though the paper is far from being a useful tool for the clinical management of CD patients, it shows an interesting new approach to be validated in a prospective way and bigger sample size in order to clarify the potential use in specific clinical situations of CD patients.