

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 62239

Title: Effect of antifoaming agent on benign colorectal tumors in colonoscopy: A meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 04022823

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FEBG, MD, MSc

Professional title: Consultant Physician-Scientist, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-04 09:09

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-13 15:01

Review time: 9 Days and 5 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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

This is a very well conducted metanalysis on the use of simethicone with PEG solutions for the bowel cleansing preparation before colonoscopy. The analysis of data and conclusions are straightforward and give insight in an area of clinical interest such as small adenomas in a difficult to reach and inspect part of the proximal colon with further implications for screening etc Some minor comments are the following: In abstract and inside text the adenomas <10mm are better to be named small because the term diminutive refers only up to 5mm size. In the Background section it is stated that "colonoscopy is a standard first-line tool for the screening". This sounds like a tenet when at the same time many national screening programs use stool tests as a first line option to be followed by colonoscopy when positive. This sentence could be rephrased appropriately. In the Methods section would be better to describe the procedural way of bowel preparation by the addition of simethicone into PEG . It is repetitively mentioned in text that "ADR is the most important indicator of colonoscopy quality". It would be more appropriate not to be so aphoristic and rephrase like being "one of the most important..." In the 6th paragraph of the Discussion Section you should make syntax correction in the sentence starting with "Second, our results.....before colonoscopy"