



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

http://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 33720

Title: Clinical impact of confocal laser endomicroscopy in the management of gas-trointestinal lesions with an uncertain diagnosis

Reviewer's code: 02551224

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-02-28

Date reviewed: 2017-03-02

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, my opinion on your article on confocal laser endomicroscopy during endoscopic examination of uncertain lesions is that it can be worth publishing, with minor changes in the text regarding the discussion, and in general the English language. I specified better in the comments to the Editor, to whom I refer you also.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 33720

Title: Clinical impact of confocal laser endomicroscopy in the management of gas-trointestinal lesions with an uncertain diagnosis

Reviewer's code: 00058340

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-02-28

Date reviewed: 2017-03-16

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 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 checked="" 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		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall the paper is interesting and points out discrepancy between endoscopic and histopathologic findings. In my opinion the paper is valuable, but requires some revisions. I encourage the authors to carefully consider several points; 1. Title: "Clinical impact of confocal laser endomicroscopy probe (p-CLE) in the management of gastrointestinal lesions". Please modify it reflect better authors' main contention. Please delete "probe" because probe alone without entire CellVizio system does not work. 2) The paper requires extensive linguistic revisions: e.g. Abstract : "Endoscopic and histopathology findings don't always correlate to certainty, leading to diagnostic and therapeutic inaccuracy. Confocal laser endomicroscopy probe (p-CLE) allows in-vivo cellular evaluation with a diagnostic accuracy above 90% for neoplastic (N) and non - neoplastic (NN) lesions" should be changed to: Endoscopic and histopathology findings don't always closely correlate, leading to diagnostic and therapeutic inaccuracy. Confocal laser endomicroscopy (CLE) allows in-vivo tissue



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

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

evaluation with a diagnostic accuracy over 90% for neoplastic (N) and non - neoplastic (NN) lesions” CONCLUSION: “p-CLE seems to be an essential diagnostic tool for patients with uncertain diagnosis with a significant clinical impact on the diagnosis and treatment”. should be changed to: CLE is a new diagnostic tool for patients with uncertain diagnosis and has a significant clinical impact on the diagnosis and treatment. Entire text require careful linguistic revisions. 3) Please remove from the entire text” p-CLE” and change it to CLE for the reason I mentioned before. 4) All figures require more detailed description and labeling with arrows. In Fig. 1c “Hystological” should be corrected to histological. Figure 1 B shows image in green color. Is this a pseudocolor? Regular CellVizio systems show black and white picture. Only CellVizio Dual band show color pictures. Please clarify this also for Fig 2B and 2C.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 33720

Title: Clinical impact of confocal laser endomicroscopy in the management of gas-trointestinal lesions with an uncertain diagnosis

Reviewer's code: 01467632

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-03-14

Date reviewed: 2017-04-07

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a retrospective analysis, evaluating the clinical impact of confocal laser endomicroscopy in the management of gastrointestinal lesions. The study focused on a very attractive topic, since pCLE is an emergent technique, becoming a reliable tool, complementary to pathology, in the diagnostic work out of gastrointestinal disorders. The study's aim is clearly defined. Authors' writing is generally clear. References are updated and well defined. However, several major issues are still present. - Authors should better clarify some of their findings: i.e. describing the characteristics of the carcinoid tumors, and the inflammation related to parasites, as seen in p-CLE. - Although a large population of patients was enrolled, results are summarized, without distinguishing different sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV and accuracy, according to the different indication and the different probe. This is a very important issue, since the accuracy is not uniform for the different indications the evaluated, as well the probes have different characteristics. - Due to the summarized results, it seems a feasibility



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

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

study, more than an evaluation of the clinical impact of a technique. - Table 2 should be revised, and data should be evaluated differently. In summary, although the topic is very interesting and attractive, this retrospective analysis has major drawbacks and the results are not convincing.