



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 42035

Title: Non-small bowel lesion detection at small bowel capsule endoscopy: a comprehensive literature review

Reviewer's code: 03029658

Reviewer's country: Portugal

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-09-10

Date reviewed: 2018-09-30

Review time: 20 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would like to congratulate the authors for writing a manuscript on a very pertinent topic regarding gastrointestinal bleeding which may help to optimize patients' management. The paper is very well written and fluent which makes it easy to read and



**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

understand. I would like to make some minor suggestions: as the "VCE" abbreviation appears only once in the manuscript I would suggest the term videocapsule endoscopy is used; the percentage symbol should appear in the vertical axis in the figures.

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 Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 42035

Title: Non-small bowel lesion detection at small bowel capsule endoscopy: a comprehensive literature review

Reviewer’s code: 00159305

Reviewer’s country: Romania

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-09-26

Date reviewed: 2018-09-30

Review time: 4 Days

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	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

To the authors, I have the following comments on your manuscript: 1. There are few spelling errors (page 5-patients are missing, page 6-you have an extra r in many words etc.). 2. You could search other databases, too. I am sure that more than 6 studies



**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

reported lesions located outside small-bowel. 3. Please, mention the strength and limitations of your review. As a clinician with experience in endoscopy and small bowel capsule endoscopy I expected more discussions on the findings instead of summarizing 6 articles. Otherwise, I enjoyed reading your manuscript and I will recommend it for publication after minor revision.

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 Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 42035

Title: Non-small bowel lesion detection at small bowel capsule endoscopy: a comprehensive literature review

Reviewer’s code: 00029962

Reviewer’s country: Italy

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-09-26

Date reviewed: 2018-10-01

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 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 checked="" 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

The Authors have reported in a minireview data on the occurrence of non-small bowel lesions revealed at SBCE. This review offers useful reflections to practising clinicians. Major issues: 1. in spite of a significant proportion of non-small bowel findings, it



**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

remains to be elucidated the impact of these diagnoses on patients' outcome. This should be stated in the discussion 2. as far as relevant findings are observed in the colon, it should be emphasized that small bowel capsules are not designed to explore and examine the colon, thus these findings should be considered as unexpected. moreover, it would be useful to know whether colonic diagnoses were made using a small bowel or a colon capsule which would impact on clinical practice. Minor point: ref 29 is outdated. look at Milano et al, Gastrointest Endosc. 2011 May;73(5):1002-8

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 Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 42035

Title: Non-small bowel lesion detection at small bowel capsule endoscopy: a comprehensive literature review

Reviewer's code: 03478442

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-09-26

Date reviewed: 2018-10-07

Review time: 11 Days

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	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The subject is extremely interesting and the effort to present it is satisfactory, but there are some points that need attention. 1. While it is a minireview, at the discussion section (page 11, line 5) the authors report the results of the study of their hospital, which are



**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

not yet published. If the authors have data for publication, it would be more appropriate to submit an original article with a discussion section which would describe the other studies. 2. From the article the reader is left with the impression that the percentages of figure 1 and figure 2 are the result of a simple summation of cases as they are presented in the studies. If this is true, this is a methodological error, while such results can only be evaluated by a metanalysis, but the authors did not follow a metanalysis methodology. 3. It would be probably better for the reader to report one by one the type of lesions detected by SBCE to upper and lower gastrointestinal tract when it is negative in the small bowel, according to the literature data and not just simple presentation of the studies and what was found in each of them. 4. It is rather uncommon for a review to include discussion section (actually what should be reported was written in the presentation of the studies and in introduction and conclusion section. It is a little confusing. 5. There are some syntax errors that should be corrected.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No