

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3701

Title: Usefulness of a continuous suction mouthpiece during esophagogastroduodenoscopy: a single-center, prospective, randomized study

Reviewer code: 00056758

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-05-16 14:59

Date reviewed: 2013-05-31 23:16

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 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

This is an interesting original article introducing a new continuous suction mouthpiece during EGD. I think that this idea is very good. There was no statistical difference about choking episode and aspiration pneumonia in this article. However, it could reduce the extent of salivary flow during EGD. This is advantageous on a hygiene side. It is thought that this device is good option about screening EGD or other treatment (ESD, ERCP etc.). It should be informative and contribute to readers in the field. I think that this article is well written. Therefore, I have no advices to the author. Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to review this article.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3701

Title: Usefulness of a continuous suction mouthpiece during esophagogastroduodenoscopy: a single-center, prospective, randomized study

Reviewer code: 01437418

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-05-16 14:59

Date reviewed: 2013-06-24 11:57

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"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a single-center, prospective, randomized study on the usefulness of a continuous suction mouthpiece (CSM) during EGD. Although interesting, substantial concerns for this study are that the background, study design, results including the tables and figures, and conclusion are so much similar to those of the authors' previous study published in Digestive Endoscopy "Maekita T et al. Usefulness of a continuous suction mouthpiece during percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy: A single-center, prospective, randomized study". Although the authors mentioned their previous article in this new manuscript, the current study adds little to the previous one. Moreover, the authors have already mentioned in their previous study that CSM is expected to reduce complications such as aspiration not only in PEG but in other upper endoscopic procedures. Since EGD is required for PEG, these two papers should be treated as one.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3701

Title: Usefulness of a continuous suction mouthpiece during esophagogastroduodenoscopy: a single-center, prospective, randomized study

Reviewer code: 00183658

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-05-16 14:59

Date reviewed: 2013-07-01 12:08

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 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)		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

My evaluation The review article from Japan is aim to demonstrate the usefulness of a continuous suction mouthpiece during screening esophagogastroduodenoscopy procedure. The title is "Usefulness of a continuous suction mouthpiece during esophagogastroduodenoscopy: a single-center, prospective, randomized study". There have some questions and uncleared issues. The authors should be clarified and be added the following issues in the text. 1. Several factors influence the outcome of the study. Some linitations of the study might be occurred. 2. The primary outcome of the study was the occurrence of aspiration pneumonia. The incidence of this primary outcome is very low. The sample size of the study might be higher than this study. 3. According to No. 2, the conclusion of the study should be "Use of the CSM during screening EGD can reduce the extent of salivary flow. The device is expected to reduce complications and contamination with saliva not only during screening EGD but also during other upper endoscopic procedures." This study demonstrated that the occurrence of aspiration pneumonia did not significantly different between the two groups. 4. The sedative used in the study was 1-5 mg. It was a high variability. The sedative agent should be defined in mg/kg. The sedative agent influenced the extent of the salivary flow. The extent of the salivary flow in the patients who received in a low dose of the mg/kg was relatively lower than in the patients who received in a high dose of the mg/kg. It might be influenced the outcome of the study. 5. The clinical application of the study is very important. The authors should be recommended the readers to apply this knowledge in routine clinical practice. 6. Unfortunately, the authors did not show the cost effectiveness of the use of CSM device for screening esophagogastroduodenoscopy procedure. Thank you so much