

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61752

Title: Impact of simethicone on bowel cleansing during colonoscopy in the Chinese patients

Reviewer's code: 00033055

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-17 20:26

Reviewer performed review: 2020-12-25 17:30

Review time: 7 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

An interesting paper comparing prospectively 2 colon preparations both used in the split fashion: a standard 4 liter PEG preparation with a 3 liter PEG preparation added with anti-foam agent simethicone. The paper has been produced in China and its worth is related to the lower efficacy of slow volume preparations in Asians. A 3-liter preparation could be thus suggested as a valuable alternative to standard 4-liter products to improve patients' acceptance. The second peculiarity of the study is the use of simethicone as an anti-foam agent in the 3 liter preparation. The paper is clear and well written. Data are clearly described. Results are reliable and consistent with the premises. My only concern is about the bubble score: to my best knowledge, there are no validated scores evaluating how bubbles may impact on colon visibility. I think that authors should describe how they have developed such a scale; otherwise, they should report in the reference where such a scale has been already validated and used.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61752

Title: Impact of simethicone on bowel cleansing during colonoscopy in the Chinese patients

Reviewer's code: 00033055

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-17

Reviewer chosen by: Chen-Chen Gao

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-14 20:07

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-14 20:16

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

With regards to my previous comment, the authors should report the 4 papers that have used the bubble scale also in the paper