

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 36508

Title: The impact of mechanical bowel preparation on clinical outcome in elective colorectal surgery: a meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 03476292

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-10-05

Date reviewed: 2017-10-05

Review time: 3 Hours

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

The authors present a comprehensive systemic review on one of the most controversial studies in colorectal and general surgery. I commend the authors for thier extensive work. A few points i think needs additional clarification (although somewhat described in the manuscript): 1. The debate abput bowel prep shifted in recent years towards MBP with Oral ABX versus periop IV abx alone. In recent years two large NSQIP studies demonstrated the superiority of MBP + oral ABX. I think this point should be highlighted with more data presented as these studies shifted the pendulum back towards MBP vs. no MBP. 2. Another point that the authors mention is the heterogenicity between different surgeons on the matter, despite the extensive data on the matter, mainly because so many studies say different things. I would highlight the article from Zmora and Wexner that did a survey among ACS surgeons demonstrating



7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

the heterogeneity. Other than that, i congratulate the authors for a job well done and an interesting read

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 36508

Title: The impact of mechanical bowel preparation on clinical outcome in elective colorectal surgery: a meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 02534438

Reviewer's country: Croatia

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-10-05

Date reviewed: 2017-10-09

Review time: 4 Days

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

Authors should discuss in more detail the use of MBP for colorectal anastomoses (left colon / sigmoid colon / anterior rectal resection). These may differ from those of colon-colon anastomoses or ileocolonic anastomoses.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 36508

Title: The impact of mechanical bowel preparation on clinical outcome in elective colorectal surgery: a meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 03645427

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-10-05

Date reviewed: 2017-10-11

Review time: 5 Days

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 checked="" 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"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No 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

Your systemic review and metaanalysis is very well-written and informative. Mechanical bowel preparation regimens vary by country and hospital, therefore its compliance and side effect is different. Given the limitation of metaanalysis, short comments and review of current regimens of mechanical bowel preparation will help us understand your conclusion.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 36508

Title: The impact of mechanical bowel preparation on clinical outcome in elective colorectal surgery: a meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 01558002

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-10-05

Date reviewed: 2017-10-12

Review time: 6 Days

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"/> [Y] 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"/> [] 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"/> [Y] No	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I enjoyed review of the manuscript, which showed that routine mechanical bowel preparation (MBP) does not benefit the patients undergoing colorectal surgery using the high-quality meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Furthermore, the study suggested that MBP might be feasible for selected patients in the real world based on the meta-analysis of observational studies. The scientific validity and clinical impact of the study seem to be superior to those of previous review studies on MBP published in major clinical journals. In have only a minor concern that mixed use of abbreviations such as MBP and LOS and non-abbreviations are repeated throughout the manuscript, which is not a standard for English writing of biomedical scientific papers.