



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 40550

**Title:** Prediction of colorectal tumor grade and invasion depth through narrow-band imaging scoring

**Reviewer’s code:** 02573214

**Reviewer’s country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Ruo-Yu Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2018-07-16

**Date reviewed:** 2018-07-21

**Review time:** 5 Days

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 Grade E: Do not publish	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

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

In this manuscript the authors reported the results on the use of statistical model for predicting tumor grade and depth invasion of colorectal cancer through narrow-band imaging scoring. They described a good number of clinical cases with interesting



**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

results. This article may be the starting point for other prospective works by other research groups to confirm the usefulness of the method.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 40550

**Title:** Prediction of colorectal tumor grade and invasion depth through narrow-band imaging scoring

**Reviewer's code:** 02462725

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Ruo-Yu Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2018-08-07

**Date reviewed:** 2018-08-08

**Review time:** 1 Day

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

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Authors retrospectively analyzed endoscopic images with NBI for colorectal neoplasia, to determine the algorism to predict tumor grade and invasion depth. 1) Although authors used a statistical model, the interpretation of images inevitably harbors



**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

inter-observer variability. In this study, two experts evaluated the images, but in the regard of inter-observer variability, the reproducibility evaluated by other endoscopists should be validated. In the regard of validation, the model constructed with the cohort of this paper should be validated with another cohort of colorectal polyps. 2) In the Tables 1 and 2, authors indicated predictability of NBI images for tumor grade and invasion depth. In contrast, in the Tables 3 and 4, authors showed the correlation between NBI images and tumor architectures. The two topics are quite different and readers would be confused because of the ambiguity of the main objective of this study. 3) Assignment of endoscopic resection or surgery does not solely depend on the depth of invasion. There are other factors including venous or lymphatic invasion, presence of budding. So, prediction of only depth of invasion would not work enough in clinical settings.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 40550

**Title:** Prediction of colorectal tumor grade and invasion depth through narrow-band imaging scoring

**Reviewer’s code:** 01441415

**Reviewer’s country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Ruo-Yu Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2018-07-25

**Date reviewed:** 2018-08-08

**Review time:** 14 Days

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

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This manuscript by Maeyama Y et al. demonstrated a usefulness of a novel scoring system using magnifying narrow-band imaging for predicting tumor grade and invasion depth. This results can be beneficial in future research and clinical practice. However



**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

there are points of concern. 1. Authors should clarify the criteria for initially included 161 lesions with NBI imaging among all observed lesions during this study period. Pedunculated type polyps were also included? There is a discrepancy of the number of the all included lesions, 160 in the abstract, and 161 in other parts. 2. “tumor grade” and “advanced cancer” should be defined clearly in the manuscript. 3. The sample size is enough and appropriate to make a solid conclusion in this topic? 4. More detailed statistical analysis in order to achieve the scoring in Table 2 should be mentioned. How does the value of each scores come to? 5. Does the value of each scores have any importance regarding sensitivity? Scoring-based systems should be interpreted into scale with different sensitivity and specificity. If the scoring system based on yes-or-no basis, there would be similar to other common classifications. 6. Please mention the outlines of place of this classification (similarity, difference, and clinical significance) between the previously known classifications such as NICE and JNET classifications. 7. In Table1, the univariate analysis of every variables in order to obtain the multivariate analysis should be shown.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication



# 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

**<https://www.wjgnet.com>**

[ ] Plagiarism

[ Y ] No