



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 52350

Title: Underwater and conventional endoscopic mucosal resection in the treatment of colorectal polyps: A meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 03822335

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Academic Fellow, Research Fellow, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Mexico

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-05-16

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-06-07 13:12

Reviewer performed review: 2020-06-14 18:57

Review time: 7 Days and 5 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have carefully reviewed the manuscript entitled: "Endoscopic resection of the underwater and conventional mucosa in the treatment of colorectal polyps: a meta-analysis" proposed for publication in this journal; and I have the following considerations: - This is a study prepared with an adequate methodology. Almost completely, all the steps are taken to carry out a systematic review. - It is not clear if the authors use two independent reviewers for the selection of the studies included in the systematic review. What is clearly expressed is that the evaluation of the quality of the studies was made by two independent reviewers and if there was any difference in score, it was resolved by consensus. - Despite the search carried out in the databases (PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Library, CNKI and Wanfang digital database); it is not mentioned if a search was made in other sources such as monographs, theses, papers presented at conferences, etc. ("gray literature"). This could lead to the exclusion of some relevant information. - As the authors already mentioned in the discussion, some of the included studies are of questionable quality and are heterogeneous. - I would take the results of the study with reserve and I would not determine them as forcefully as the authors do because the analysis included only one randomized study, the rest of the studies as described in Table 1, are retrospective cohorts. By targeting the precision and safety of a procedure, it is not appropriate for me to make decisions based on retrospective studies (87.5% of the studies included in the analysis). - Some formatting errors that stand out are the following: in the "abstract", change the word "postoperative" to "post-endoscopic resection", since endoscopic resection is not considered a surgical procedure. In this same section in the penultimate line, change "和" by "vs" or "and". Define the abbreviation EMR (endoscopic mucosal resection). Separate the "Introduction" section of the "abstract" and name it as such.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 52350

Title: Underwater and conventional endoscopic mucosal resection in the treatment of colorectal polyps: A meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 03479745

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Singapore

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-05-16

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-06-10 01:33

Reviewer performed review: 2020-06-14 21:50

Review time: 4 Days and 20 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

General Comments: I commend the authors in their effort to visit this topic. They have done the appropriate steps necessary in the conduct of this meta analysis. It is of course unfortunate that no better available quality studies are available in order for the results to have a better effect. Nonetheless, i think the Authors should explore in their discussion section some issues for example the high recurrence rate of 15.15% in the control group at 3 months. Are there any on-going RCTs? Finally, the article would benefit with some paraphrasing and improving of language quality. Below are further specific comments: It appears that a meta-analysis at this moment is precocious so the authors should justify the conduct of this meta-analysis with a better robust discussion. In the discussion section - I have comments on this section, "The meta-analysis revealed that, compared with the EMR group, the en bloc resection rate was improved, the recurrence rate was decreased and the operation time was shortened, while the incidence of adverse events was not significantly different in the UEMR group. Therefore, the curative effect of UEMR was superior to that of EMR, while there was no increase in the incidence of adverse events." A. Procedure time, not operation time unless authors routinely perform this procedure under General or Regional anaesthesia. B. I do not believe the phrase to use is that curative effect of UEMR was superior to that of EMR, to begin with this was not a trial powered for superiority. Such a misleading statement should not be said. it could be paraphased to say it appears based on this study to be some benefits of UEMR as compared to EMR, in particular to treatment outcomes. Also in discussion: " All measurements in this study were subject to the clinical experience of surgeons." Endoscopists is a better word than surgeons as this is an endoscopic procedure. In the abstract results section the line "In subgroup analysis, the en bloc resection rate showed no statistically significant difference between the



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

UEMR and UEMR groups for polyps with lesion diameters less than 20 mm. " - There must be a typographical error as this sentence does not make sense, UEMR vs UEMR? In same section, another sentence there is a chinese word use to replace the english word of "and", " Additionally, the incidence of adverse events was 8.17%和 6.21%, with an RR value of 1.07 (95% CI: 0.50~2.30; P=0.86), but with no significant difference."



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 52350

Title: Underwater and conventional endoscopic mucosal resection in the treatment of colorectal polyps: A meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00916026

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-05-16

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-06-08 13:58

Reviewer performed review: 2020-06-20 16:07

Review time: 12 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper is interesting, well written and useful for clinical purposes. You could add which was the size range of considered polyps.