



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

**Manuscript NO:** 70800

**Title:** Texture and color enhancement imaging in magnifying endoscopic evaluation of colorectal adenomas

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05462117

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Academic Fellow, Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

**Author's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-08-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-08-19 02:58

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-08-31 03:36

**Review time:** 12 Days

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

The is an industry sponsored study, wherein the authors evaluate a new feature on the Olympus endoscope, the TXI. The aim of the study is to evaluate the effect of TXI on colorectal lesions, versus the conventional modes on the endoscope, such as WLI, NBI and CE. This is a retrospective single center study enrolling around 60 patients. The results suggest that TXI is superior to WLI and CE for most assessed outcomes and inferior to NBI. Though this is a necessary study with the results having widespread implications, as Olympus unveils its new technology worldwide, the quality of the manuscript requires some improvement. The following are the suggested changes that can be made to the manuscript prior to consideration for publication: 1) Firstly, the study should state clearly its aim - that the results only apply to Tubular Adenomas, as that is the only type of lesion that was evaluated by the different modalities and therefore the results of this study cannot be generalized to other colorectal lesions, such as cancer or other polyp histologies. 2) Authors state there is only one clinical study for TXI by Ishikawa et. al, however there exists another namely "Visibility of early gastric cancer in texture and color enhancement imaging" by Seiichiro Abe et al. Furthermore, a Clinical trial is currently ongoing in Adelaide, Australia for colon polyps in which WLI is compared to TXI. 3) The authors are advised to expand on the methods section of this paper to include more detail of the experimental process. For instances, Authors should outline more clearly the process of colonoscopy where these polyps were imaged. They state that images for different modality were taken within 15s of each other. However, when was CE done? was it the last modality? because the dye used for CE may unfairly enhance other modalities of imaging, such as NBI, if the CE was done prior to the NBI. 4)



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](https://www.wjgnet.com)

The number of patients enrolled in the study should also be mentioned in the methods section (currently only mentioned in the results section), and it should be clearly stated that only one polyp per patient was examined. 5) Authors also mention that patients who underwent polypectomy were excluded. Please elaborate on this. Are we referring to hot snare polypectomy or polyps of a particular size? and please explain the reason to exclude such patients. 6) The authors define the size, morphology and location of the adenomas - were these consistent with and representative of the general population? If not, then these results cannot be generalized to the entire population. It is recommended to add the statistics of the polyp characteristics of japan in order to compare with your center. 7) What is aspirational endoscopist in the introduction section? 8) What is the retinex theory? please define this in layman's term for the intended audience of the paper 9) "A8 was used for WLI for enhanced structure level" - please elaborate further on what "A8" is, and what is being conveyed here to the non-technical audience of the journal 10) Add Olympus, JNET and NBI to key words I am unable to see the reference list in this manuscript.