

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 71408

**Title:** Comparison of Bowel Cleansing Efficacy and Patient Tolerability between Same-Day Single Dose and Large-Volume Split-Dose Regimens of Polyethylene Glycol for Bowel Preparation: An Updated Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05430706

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-09-08

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-09-27 00:48

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-09-27 02:04

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<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 Grade E: Do not publish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

Thank you very much for the opportunity to evaluate this article. The manuscript deals with an important topic to evaluate the efficacy and tolerability of SSD PEG-based arm versus large-volume ( $\geq 3L$ ) SpDs of PEG solutions for bowel preparation before colonoscopy, with regardless of adding adjuvant laxative. The manuscript is very well written in English, and this review topic is of great clinical importance. I suggest the authors consider the following comments to improve the quality of the manuscript.

Major comments - This review did not fully follow the PRISMA statements. Please review and complete the PRISMA 2020 checklist. In particular, there is no assessment of publication bias and GRADE approach.

Minor comments

Introduction - As mentioned in the second paragraph of the discussion, the author should describe the differences from previous systematic review and the novelty of the current study in the introduction section.

Methods - Please provide a complete electronic search strategy that can be used repeatedly as well as search terms. - Please indicate whether there are any language restrictions in the literature search. - For any missing data, please specify whether the authors asked the original author or not. - The authors should specify assessment for publication bias (e.g. funnel plots and Egger's tests). - The authors should add an assessment of the quality for each outcome, not each study, using the GRADE approach.

Results - The authors should evaluate publication bias (e.g. funnel plots and Egger's tests). - The authors should evaluate the certainty of the evidence according to GRADE approach for each outcome.

Discussion - The authors should discuss the certainty of the evidence.

Appendix - PRISMA statement has been updated to the PRISMA 2020

Statement (BMJ. 2021;372:n71.).

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 71408

**Title:** Comparison of Bowel Cleansing Efficacy and Patient Tolerability between Same-Day Single Dose and Large-Volume Split-Dose Regimens of Polyethylene Glycol for Bowel Preparation: An Updated Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05230210

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Egypt

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-09-08

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-10-29 07:58

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-11-07 15:13

**Review time:** 9 Days and 7 Hours

<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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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

I would like to thank the authors for their work. Notes on manuscript: English language: needs extensive revision. (There is no English revision certificate) Title: Comparison of Bowel Cleaning Efficacy and Patient Tolerability of Same-Day Single Does and Large-Volume Split-Does Regimens of Polyethylene Glycol for Bowel Preparation: an Updated Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Please correct, "Does" to "dose" (and all over the rest of the text) Abstract: #Background: The author stated that their aim was " The meta-analysis was aimed to evaluate the efficacy and tolerability of SSDs of PEG for bowel preparation. ", but this metaanalysis as the title and methods stated is to "compare" the standard split dose versus the Single dose regimens, please modify. #Methods: abbreviations mentioned for the first time without full text (RR or MD) please add full text when mentioned for the first time. The authors stated, " Random effects model or fixed effects model were reported for a heterogeneity analysis among studies." Kindly elaborate which one was used first, and which was used when heterogeneity detected, and at what level of heterogeneity? #Results: The authors stated " Eighteen studies were included." Kindly state the type of studies e.g. RCTs or cohort etc. The authors mentioned " There was no statistically significant difference between (2L/4L)" and " The pooled analysis offered to favor of SSDs for less sleep disturbance " etc., please state in numbers what is the RR or MD for all the outcomes, not just the CI. Keywords: kindly change " Split-does" to Split-Dose" Introduction: #Authors wrote " but some patients were unsatisfaction">>change to "unsatisfied" # The authors stated " We hypothesize that SSDs of PEG-based bowel preparation solution is not

inferior in bowel cleanliness and better patient tolerance to sleep disturbance and side effects." But I think this is not the correct way to write the research question, because they are biased in their hypothesis, they could state a neutral research question (to compare between the two interventions not predicting the effect from the start), as written later on. Methods: 1- The search words is a weak presentation of the search strategy, a better search strategy is using all of the synonymous terms to the keywords and using effective Boleyn search tools according to the database they are searching. 2- The authors wrote "References from the reviewed articles were also searched in order to identify relevant articles that may have been missed." did they mean review articles on the topic? 3- The authors mentioned the data extraction without mentioning the results of their research, how many duplicates as they searched different databases (also please add to the flow chart). And how they did the screening, whether one or two authors conducted the screening independently? 4- The authors mentioned that they used "modified Jadad scoring system" could the authors explain why didn't they use the risk of bias tool ROF2 only in RevMan? as they stated without any details "The Cochrane risk tool was also used to assess study bias.". Also the authors stated that most studies had unclear risk of bias in (other types of bias) as shown in figure 2 but they didn't state what are the items of the other risks they found in the individual studies. 5- The authors stated they used "Weighted mean differences", do they mean SMD (which is the one present in revman)? #Results: 1- In FIGURE 1. Flow diagram of trial selection": The flow chart didn't show each stage (duplicates, title and abstract screening, full text screening) it only states the number of studies retrieved, please modify to include this data. 2- sometimes the authors use I2 or I-square please unify throughout the text according to the journal guidelines. 3- there is no mention of publication bias, although the authors included 18 studies where they could draw funnel plot to assess publication bias #Discussion: How the authors explain the discrepancy between their results and the



**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>

previous metaanalysis done (4-Liter Split-Dose Polyethylene Glycol Is Superior to Other Bowel Preparations, Based on Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Enestvedt, Brintha K. et al. Clinical Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Volume 10, Issue 11, 1225 - 1231)  
#References: 1- The paper has no references to check at the end?? 2- I found a lot of RCTs not mentioned in the table of included references (only mentioned by first author-year).