

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5717

Title: Patient Prompting of Their Physician Resulted in Increased Colon Cancer Screening Referrals

Reviewer code: 00004678

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-09-24 09:14

Date reviewed: 2013-09-24 12:58

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have no further comments on this well written manuscript.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5717

Title: Patient Prompting of Their Physician Resulted in Increased Colon Cancer Screening Referrals

Reviewer code: 00503404

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-09-24 09:14

Date reviewed: 2013-09-25 08:24

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very important clinical question; the aims of the study are clearly of high relevance. Comments; 1. The only major comment is the relatively small cohort size, therefore interpretation of the results should be realistic, and the study as such should be interpreted as a pilot 2. Moreover it is somewhat controversial that patients after declining to consent for colonoscopy were not offered any alternative methods, some of these although could be explained by financial reasons, but in the discussion authors should clearly list this as a limitation and give insight on how the program could be improved by offering alternative methods in referral where the subject declines endoscopy.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5717

Title: Patient Prompting of Their Physician Resulted in Increased Colon Cancer Screening Referrals

Reviewer code: 00058121

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-09-24 09:14

Date reviewed: 2013-09-28 01:24

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well constructed study, of high clinical significance. It seems that it is sufficiently powered to detect pre-specified 25% difference in referral frequency, but in my opinion this sample size is not sufficiently enough to portray independent predictors resulting in declining referral between insured and underinsured patients. Inclusion criteria for CRC-S are not provided. Some of the results are given for first time in the discussion e.g.: First, college education were more prevalence in patients with medical insurance coverage (43% vs. 11%)..... The most important issue is the lack of a logistic regression model that would unmask independent predictors for referral reject between insured and underinsured patients.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5717

Title: Patient Prompting of Their Physician Resulted in Increased Colon Cancer Screening Referrals

Reviewer code: 00503618

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-09-24 09:14

Date reviewed: 2013-09-30 04:43

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is interesting conceptually. The intervention is educating patients to educate their primary care provider about screening colonoscopy. This makes sense and forms the basis to increase public awareness of effective screening for cancer. If a patient initiates the discussion about cancer screening, it seems intuitive that the provider will act upon the prompt. On the other hand, it appears that providers are less efficient about recommending screening for colorectal cancer if not prompted by their patients.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5717

Title: Patient Prompting of Their Physician Resulted in Increased Colon Cancer Screening Referrals

Reviewer code: 00058269

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-09-24 09:14

Date reviewed: 2013-10-06 16:42

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting concept of the study. In is interesting to know the level of residences of two groups, gender, and age. Can you perform additional analysis according to this paramenters?

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5717

Title: Patient Prompting of Their Physician Resulted in Increased Colon Cancer Screening Referrals

Reviewer code: 00044509

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-09-24 09:14

Date reviewed: 2013-10-06 16:44

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major 1. It is very important issue that only 60% of eligible patients are screened for CRC-S in the US. However, it is also easily expected that prompting of physicians promotes screening referrals. Although the authors selected two types of clinic, results were almost same except financial affordability. 2. It seems to be effective to giving pamphlet, but its contents are important. The authors should describe about pamphlet in detail. 3. Unfortunately, it is though that there is little significance of this study because acceptance rates from referrals did not increase.