

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 45414

**Title:** Effect of Endocuff use on colonoscopy outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 00070280

**Reviewer's country:** Sri Lanka

**Science editor:** Ruo-Yu Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2018-12-29

**Date reviewed:** 2019-01-06

**Review time:** 3 Hours, 8 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 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

This is a good study on an important topic. this can be accepted.

### 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
- ☐ No

*BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 45414

**Title:** Effect of Endocuff use on colonoscopy outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 02549032

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Ruo-Yu Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2019-01-21

**Date reviewed:** 2019-01-22

**Review time:** 11 Hours, 1 Day

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 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 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

This is a potentially interesting metanalyses on the role of the endocuff for adenoma detection rate. Finally 9 studies included for analyses. The authors concluded <<Endocuff-assisted colonoscopy increases adenoma detection rate compared to

conventional colonoscopy>>. However some major issues are very important: 1. Although the authors stated that their meta-analysis is more accurate than the 3 other recent meta-analyses with the same issue, the conclusion is the same. Actually another metanalyses with the same articles is too much for this issue. It would be advisable to wait for more information and data from multiple worldwide centers. I cant really understand what was the substantial need of this meta-analysis and what more does the present metanalyses add to the existing literature? 2. One of the major conclusions was negative: <<In terms of AADR and MAC, no difference was detected between EAC and CC>>. So it would be advisable to focus also to this main result in the conclusion of the abstract in order this meta-analysis to be clinically useful in terms of accuracy and objectivity. 3. We congratulate the authors to discuss about cost-effectiveness although this was not the aim of this meta-analysis. To our knowledge there are no studies on cost-effectiveness in relation to endocuff use. 4. Despite the positive conclusions of the present study, endocuff is not widespread accepted. Did the authors find any possible explanations? 5. We noticed that the majority of references regarding use of endocuff are from the same authors of the present study. 7,8,9,30. Obviously the authors begin with a positive attitude towards the use of endocuff. In order to persuade the international community of the usefulness of this device more data from different centers worldwide are necessary and advisable. Did the authors have any conflict of interest or financial interest? 6. The authors concluded:<<Use of the Endocuff during routine colonoscopy examination improves adenoma detection>> However this conclusion is true for operators with low-to moderate ADRs and not to all operators especially to operators with high ADRs. For the latter operators the use of endocuff might be costly and complicated. 7. In the title the question <<Does Endocuff use increase adenoma detection rate?>> predisposes the conclusion before hand. For neutrality and objectivity of the study question should be avoided at the title. 8.



**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>

Another issue is the quality of colonoscopic preparation eg Boston Bowel Prep Scale (BBRS) score and endocuff use. Are there any studies? No such information are included in this study. 9. There is plagiarism in the discussion. The authors in page 15 discussed a recently network meta-analysis of other than endocuff modalities that might improve ADR. Although this discussion is interesting has no relation to the issue.

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

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

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

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

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No