

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18272

Title: Colorectal Cancer Screening Rates in an Urban Ambulatory Clinic by Internal Medicine Residents Compared to the National Average

Reviewer's code: 03270879

Reviewer's country: Singapore

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-04-16 10:51

Date reviewed: 2015-05-04 12:23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A well done and well performed study. Interesting and certainly can be replicated in family medicine residency training programmes

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18272

Title: Colorectal Cancer Screening Rates in an Urban Ambulatory Clinic by Internal Medicine Residents Compared to the National Average

Reviewer's code: 03002684

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-04-16 10:51

Date reviewed: 2015-05-15 15:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Although this is interesting research, further clarifications and improvements need to be made and this paper will need further review. Please use acronym 'CRC' in sentences consistently. In the introduction section, previous studies addressing relationship between doctor's post graduate year level of training and CRC screening rates in patients should be reviewed and summarized more specifically on the manuscript. Importance of this study is unclear and should be more emphasized in the introduction section. Limitations of this study should be described in the discussion section. As the author mentioned on the manuscript, study sample was skewed in ethnic groups and in age groups, which may affect significant differences among ethnic groups and age groups in the result section.