PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases
Manuscript NO: 33361
Title: New device to implement the adenoma detection rate
Reviewer's code: 00724887
Reviewer's country: India
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2017-02-07
Date reviewed: 2017-02-09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for
[Y] Grade C: Good	polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	publication
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor	language polishing	[Y] No	[ ] Minor revision
	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Well written review

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases
Manuscript NO: 33361
Title: New device to implement the adenoma detection rate
Reviewer's code: 00717554
Reviewer's country: Iran
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2017-04-13
Date reviewed: 2017-04-14

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for
[Y] Grade C: Good	polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	publication
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor	language polishing	[Y] No	[Y] Minor revision
	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would like to mention the following comments: 1-Abstract is too short, without any categorized parts.   2-The format of article does not follow the format of systematic review.   3-The search method is not clear. It needs more explanation.   4-The tables and figures should be explained in a right place.   5- As a reader, the article should be rewritten with more structured design, in order to give its message to the reader.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases
Manuscript NO: 33361
Title: New device to implement the adenoma detection rate
Reviewer's code: 00227403
Reviewer's country: Italy
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2017-04-25
Date reviewed: 2017-05-04

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for
[Y] Grade C: Good	polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	publication
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor	language polishing	[Y] No	[ ] Minor revision
	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors should clarify: 1) the method used to choose the patients; 2) the rate of complete examination of the colon.