

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 9150

**Title:** Reduced incidence and mortality from colorectal cancer with flexible sigmoidoscopy screening:  
A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer code:** 02467528

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2014-01-24 15:12

**Date reviewed:** 2014-02-08 19:41

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	<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 meta-analysis provides an interesting insight about the effect of screening with flexible sigmoidoscopy on incidence and mortality of colorectal cancer. The manuscript is interesting and well written, I proposed to the authors minor concerns. Minor revisions 1. Results section: a) I suggest to change the layout of the figure 1 using a traditional flow diagram with rectangular box. In addition, the authors report that the literature research produced 1323 articles but the figure 1 shows initially 1783 articles. Why? Furthermore, if we add up the studies in the last box the result obtained is 71 and not 75 as declared in the text. Why? b) I wonder why the patients in the control group and in the screened group derived from the table 1 are different from the number declared in the text (249,707 vs 266,000 for the control group and 165,653 vs 173,000 for the screened group). 2. Tables: a) The authors should revise Table 1 adding a comma after the patients per group in the study of Segnan et al. 2011. b) The table 2 is cited in the text but is not attached in the manuscript. 3. Please check all the references, they are not comply with the journal style.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 9150

**Title:** Reduced incidence and mortality from colorectal cancer with flexible sigmoidoscopy screening:  
A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer code:** 02456047

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2014-01-24 15:12

**Date reviewed:** 2014-02-10 12:45

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)	<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 meta-analysis study is well-written and provides good information about the effect of screening with flexible sigmoidoscopy on incidence and mortality of colorectal cancer. However, there are some minor issues that require revisions. First, the authors should entail some information regarding the extent of disagreement between two authors when including the studies for analysis and describe the steps of how consensus were reached among three authors. Second, the authors should use a traditional flowchart for figure 1. Also, the authors indicated that 1323 articles were originally identified via literature search; however, the figure 1 showed initially 1783 articles. Moreover, in the box the authors should clearly indicate that 71 studies were excluded before they delineated the numbers of excluded articles due to various reasons. Third, in the discussion section the authors indicated "similar CRC incidence reduction in men and women," but there seems no such finding in the result section. Fourth, all of the RR results for incidence and mortality were below 1, which means the exposed group is less likely to expose to the disease than the unexposed group. I am curious if the FS screening has potential sensitivity issue? Fifth, the numbers of participants in the text were not the same in the Table. Please check all tables carefully. Lastly, please check whether all the references comply with the journal guideline.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 9150

**Title:** Reduced incidence and mortality from colorectal cancer with flexible sigmoidoscopy screening:  
A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer code:** 02478683

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2014-01-24 15:12

**Date reviewed:** 2014-02-11 02:00

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

I have read with huge interest the systematic review and meta-analysis performed by Shorff et al. Specific Comments: Title: It is suitable for the contents of the study. Abstract: It summarizes clearly the purpose of this review. Material and methods: The assessment of all the four studies, their similarities and differences, the statistical analysis of every item and the treatment for publication bias have been correctly explained. Discussion: The authors have exhaustively described the limitations of this current meta- analysis. The discussion is very valuable and shows sound arguments. I only want to remark the lack of references for some affirmations : Pag 14, line 16: Colonoscopy has become the preferred first test for CRC screening in the US. Pag 19, Last sentence: proven benefits of FS, lower rates of complications with FS than with colonoscopy and feasibility in clinical practice (demonstrated by use over many years in a very large Health Care Maintenance organization Kaiser Permanente)