Baishideng Publishing Group

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 39536

Title: Randomised controlled trial comparing the Modified Sano's (MS) classification and NBI International Colorectal Endoscopic (NICE) classification for colorectal lesions

Reviewer's code: 03434027

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-04-26

Date reviewed: 2018-05-04

Review time: 8 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript: [Y] Advanced [ ] General [ ] No expertise Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Nevertheless this manuscript will add the the field of endoscopy and gastroenterology,you need to continue your work for more improvement in colonic polyps management throughout more cooperation between the new endoscopic

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

technology and much accurate international scoring systems.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

Baishideng Publishing Group

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 39536

Title: Randomised controlled trial comparing the Modified Sano's (MS) classification and NBI International Colorectal Endoscopic (NICE) classification for colorectal lesions

Reviewer's code: 03478404

Reviewer's country: Romania

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-06-04

Date reviewed: 2018-06-04

Review time: 11 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript: [Y] Advanced [ ] General [ ] No expertise Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript entitled "Randomised controlled trial comparing the Modified Sano's (MS) classification and NBI International Colorectal Endoscopic (NICE) classification for colorectal lesions" describes a prospective study comparing utility of the Modified

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

Sano's classification versus the NBI International Colorectal Endoscopic (NICE) classification in differentiating colorectal polyps. The authors concluded that MS classification was superior in differentiating non-neoplastic from neoplastic polyps and more accurately guided the endoscopic resection when compared to the NICE classification. Also, very important, MS was accurate for predicting SSA/P histology, a subtype that is not considered in the NICE classification. Otherwise, there was no statistical difference between both classifications for PIVI thresholds in managing diminutive polyps and determining post-polypectomy surveillance period. The trial was well performed and conclusions are of paramount importance, with the view of changing treatment paradigms and modifying our practice. The paper should definitely benefit the readers. The manuscript is also well structured. The "Abstract" and "Core Tip" contain the most important data reflecting the content of the manuscript. The information presented in the "Introduction" is pertinent and enough to reflect the actual status of knowledge. Maybe you could insert "nature" or "type" or histology" – whatever you may prefer in: "In vivo prediction of the neoplastic or non-neoplastic "…." of colorectal lesions is hence of utmost importance". Also, maybe you could rephrase "All studies did not include sessile serrated adenoma/polyp" to "All studies excluded sessile serrated adenoma/polyp" or "Sessile serrated adenoma/polyp was not considered separately in these studies" "Methods" are very well described, including statistical analysis. Minor comment: I wonder why "histopathology was evaluated initially by a non-gastrointestinal (non-GI) specialist pathologist…". "Results" are beautifully described and written. Minor comment: The authors wrote: "Characteristics of the polyps were not significantly different between both arms (table 4). Please write "except for the mean size" – you mentioned in Table 4 a P value of 0.0036. "Discussion" paragraph analysed all available data, truly one could not add more to this paragraph. Limitations are also presented. Minor comments: Please correct "The study did not

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

includes SSA/Ps" – English mistake. "Figures": Please insert Figure 1 for "CONSORT 2010 Flow Diagram", as well as in the text (where you consider appropriate). Figure 1: Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves of Sano and NICE Classification for neoplastic differentiation – should be then changed to Figure 2. Figure 2: Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves of Sano and NICE Classification for endoscopic resectability – should be then Figure 3. "Tables" do not respect the required format. Table 3 – please insert "NS – non-significant" under the table. Same table: the meaning of the star in the table is not explained. Classification, Modified Sano's, NICE and P value appear twice in Table 3. Table 4. Please write the meaning of the star (*). Please delete "=" from "≤5mm=" Table 5. Please give more details. Table 6. Interpretation please. OTHER COMMENTS: 1. This is a prospective study. However, there is no mention that "The authors have read the CONSORT 2010 Statement, and the manuscript was prepared and revised according to the CONSORT 2010 Statement" – This is required. 2. There is no attached info about "Informed Consent". According to the journal rules, any research article describing a study (clinical research and case report) involving humans should contain a statement in the TITLE PAGE clearly stating that all involved persons (subjects or legally authorized representative) gave their informed consent (written or verbal, as appropriate) prior to study inclusion. No file about IRB approval has been provided. 3. There are no "Conflict-of-interest" and no "Copyright license agreement" files attached, even if they are required. Since this is a general rule, then it should be respected by everyone, regardless of how excellent (or not) the content of the paper may be. 4. References are not written and also not inserted in the text according to the required style.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

Baishideng Publishing Group

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 same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

Baishideng Publishing Group

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 39536

Title: Randomised controlled trial comparing the Modified Sano's (MS) classification and NBI International Colorectal Endoscopic (NICE) classification for colorectal lesions

Reviewer's code: 03476292

Reviewer's country: Israel

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-06-04

Date reviewed: 2018-06-05

Review time: 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript: [ ] Advanced [Y] General [ ] No expertise Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well written manuscript, I have no further comments

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Baishideng Publishing Group

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

Google Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

Baishideng Publishing Group

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 39536

Title: Randomised controlled trial comparing the Modified Sano's (MS) classification and NBI International Colorectal Endoscopic (NICE) classification for colorectal lesions

Reviewer's code: 03806663

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-06-04

Date reviewed: 2018-06-08

Review time: 4 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript: [Y] Advanced [ ] General [ ] No expertise Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

it is a hard work, but i had some comments: 1- I suggest you put definitions to some words and models in the beginning of your paper that are used in your paper e.g diminutive polyps, modified MS, SSA, PIVI,.... 2- You mention the limitations of your

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

paper, but i ask can you solve some of them e.g more than one endoscopist can do the work. 3-I wonder if you can make randomization that allows applying MS and NICE to both arms of the study. 4- some comments are included in the uploaded file.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

Baishideng Publishing Group

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 39536

Title: Randomised controlled trial comparing the Modified Sano's (MS) classification and NBI International Colorectal Endoscopic (NICE) classification for colorectal lesions

Reviewer's code: 03474095

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-06-04

Date reviewed: 2018-06-09

Review time: 5 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript: [Y] Advanced [ ] General [ ] No expertise Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study authors compared in Randomised controlled trial comparing the Modified Sano's (MS) classification and NBI International Colorectal Endoscopic (NICE) classification for colorectal lesions. Design of study is good- but pity as single operator

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

study- will these results be generalised ? this limitation need further elaboration in discussion. I would like authors to comment, why did they not chose JNET classification that is now considered gold standard and Sano is used less. I would like authors to state about JNET in instruction and in discussion why they chose MS VS NICE. overall its a well designed study that will interest many readers.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No