

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34386

Title: Efficacy and adverse events of cold versus hot polypectomy

Reviewer's code: 01714224

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-04-22

Date reviewed: 2017-04-22

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 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The letter Efficacy and adverse events of cold versus hot polypectomy by Huanhuan Sun et al is a comment to a metanalysis regarding papers comparing cold versus hot polypectomy. The criticisms addressed to the metanalysis seem to be appropriate and deserve to be replied.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34386

Title: Efficacy and adverse events of cold versus hot polypectomy

Reviewer's code: 02441325

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-04-22

Date reviewed: 2017-05-09

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"/> 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 checked="" 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

1. 1st paragraph, 2nd line "the utility of cold polypectomy over hot with respect to efficacy and adverse events.", should be "the use of cold versus hot polypectomy ..." 2. Same paragraph, line 4 "randomized controlled trials (RCT)" should be "randomized controlled trials (RCTs)" 3. Line 5, "one of which is actually retrospective study" should be "one of which is actually a retrospective study" 4. The same line, "However," Should be "In addition," 5. 2nd paragraph, line 7-9 "However, among the six included studies, one compared hot snare, cold snare and cold forceps polypectomy for diminutive colorectal polyps, and the other five studies compared hot snare with cold snare polypectomy for small polyps (10 mm or less in diameter, and most were 8 mm or less)" Please cite the references respectively. 6. The 3rd paragraph "However the enrolled study by Horiuchi A et al. was focus on small colorectal polyps in patients receiving anticoagulation therapy" should be "The study by Horiuchi A et al., however, focused on small colorectal polyps in patients receiving anticoagulation therapy"