



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, 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 Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34304

Title: Randomized clinical trial comparing fixed-time split dosing and split dosing of oral Picosulfate regimen for bowel preparation

Reviewer's code: 02823396

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2017-04-24

Date reviewed: 2017-04-25

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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"/> 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 checked="" 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 have revised this article focused on the evaluation of the efficacy of two protocols regimens based on sodium picosulfate. The authors have not found any differences. As endoscopist I would like the authors give us which is the preferable choice based on their experience. Some gramatical minor mistakes have to be corrected



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, 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 Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34304

Title: Randomized clinical trial comparing fixed-time split dosing and split dosing of oral Picosulfate regimen for bowel preparation

Reviewer's code: 03253495

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2017-04-24

Date reviewed: 2017-04-25

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 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 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Informative and well-conducted RCT. Some concerns may be raised on the novelty of the paper since this field has already been explored, by the way another RCT adds to the current knowledge and improves the quality of evidence of forthcoming guidelines.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34304

Title: Randomized clinical trial comparing fixed-time split dosing and split dosing of oral Picosulfate regimen for bowel preparation

Reviewer's code: 02521800

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2017-04-12

Date reviewed: 2017-04-29

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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input 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

Dear Editor and Authors, I have read and evaluated the manuscript (ms) entitled "Randomized clinical trial comparing fixed-time split dosing and split dosing of oral Picosulfate regimen for bowel preparation" that was submitted to your journal as to be evaluated for publication. I have some comments about this ms as you could find below; 1. There are few typing errors (i.e; PGE instead of PEG in Introduction, as an abbreviation) 2. In Table 3 the last group is seen as take 2+3 Sachets: is this true or typing error? 3. The regular recommendation of Sodium picosulfate (Picolight) is two sachets either in the same day (separately for 4 hour intervals) or split dose in the day before and during colonoscopy procedure. However with this recommendation your success rate is relatively lower than expected (Table 3). How do you explain this results? 4. When you recommend 3 sachets of Sodium picosulfate; is there any dose related problems in the future as this dose is greater than the recommended dose from Summaries of Product Characteristics (SPC)? Sincerely.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34304

Title: Randomized clinical trial comparing fixed-time split dosing and split dosing of oral Picosulfate regimen for bowel preparation

Reviewer's code: 01441415

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2017-04-24

Date reviewed: 2017-05-03

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" 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

This manuscript by Jae Hyuck Jun, et al. reported a non-inferiority of fixed-time split dosing of Picosulfate regimen against split dosing for bowel preparation of colonoscopy. The fixed-time split dosing, regardless the examination time, is convenient for patients and medical staffs, so this manuscript involves a certain degree of information to the readers. However, over 30% patients of both group required 3rd sachet of oral dosing. This variation of number of sachets could be confounding to the results. The language quality of this well-written manuscript is almost acceptable, but several types were seen. The brush up of English is recommended. The quality of statistics is open to considerable questions. In the non-inferiority trial, results are recommended to express and analyze by confident interval. Both analyses of intention-to-treat and per-protocol are recommended shown. Although the differences are not statistically significant, adverse effects such as nausea and vomiting, are disproportionate to the fixed-time group. Authors are recommended to discuss it.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34304

Title: Randomized clinical trial comparing fixed-time split dosing and split dosing of oral Picosulfate regimen for bowel preparation

Reviewer's code: 00033377

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2017-04-24

Date reviewed: 2017-05-11

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 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 checked="" 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

Abstract: "For afternoon procedures, a fixed-time split dose regimen is equally effective and more convenient for the subjects. " There is no data to support the regimen is more convenient to patients as patient satisfaction was not an outcome. INTRODUCTION "Currently, colorectal cancer is the third most common cancer in the western world". I believe it is the second, please verify. " In 27% of patients who had poor bowel preparation, more than 10 mm of polyps were not observed on the first colonoscopy, and the importance of bowel preparation was further emphasized." This sentence needs to be rephrased. "A variety of bowel preparation agents have been developed to reduce the large amount of water consumption" should state fluid in place of water. " Additionally, in patients who have to undergo ultrasound or esophagogastroduodenoscopy at the same time, the results may not be accurate" Sentence needs to be rephrased. METHODS Additional data is required, what was the difference in time between the last ingestion of laxative and colonoscopy among the



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

groups? It seems the afternoon group had more of a lag between finishing the laxative and the colonoscopy. A sub-analysis of patients who underwent colonoscopy in the afternoon would be desirable. It is also important that nowhere in the paper is there an analysis of the time between the colonoscopy and ingestion of the preparation. It is conceivable that patients randomized to fixed dosing did not comply with the time they were supposed to take or viceversa. There were fewer patients in the afternoon and the way the protocol is designed there does not appear to be much difference in time between finishing the laxative and colonoscopy among the study groups for those patients who underwent an am colonoscopy. In addition, a third sachet was taken by a third of patients and this and the time in which this was consumed can skew results as well. RESULTS: Patients were excluded for failure to complete bowel preparation as advised (n=16). It is not clear what this means. If it is that patients were not able to tolerate, should not be excluded. Patients were also excluded for a completely unprepared colon (n=7, fixed-time split dose group; 4, split dose group; 3) but these should not be excluded provided they followed instructions. DISCUSSION "Sixty-seven patients (68% of fixed-time split dose group) and 70 patients (67% of split dose group) completed bowel preparation with two sachets of sodium picosulfate (Tab.3)" This sentence should be on the results section> "), the number of patients enrolled in the afternoon group was smaller (74 vs. 25). " should be on the results section