

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3389

Title: Risk of sedation for diagnostic esophagogastroduodenoscopy in patients with obstructive sleep apnea

Reviewer code: 00504802

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-04-27 20:05

Date reviewed: 2013-05-08 12:21

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 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

It is generally a well-written paper: it has an excellent Core Tip section to “advertise” the paper , well-summarized results section adding meaningfully to the existing literature on an important subject and the rest of the sections are also well-written. The bibliography is focused and well-researched. Thus, on the overall, while it is only a small study, it is a fair one. Most of my concerns are related to Editing in nature, thus minors Significant issues: Results and Tables: Table 2; would the midazolam dosing be any different, if adjusted for body weight? May be should be at least mentioned in the text Table 3.: my concern here is that we have 9 parameters entered into multivariate analysis, whereas the cohort size is only in the 90s (of these only 31 with OSA, unbalanced in numbers to the healthy cohort). Notice that OSA was approaching significance ($p=0.068$) - this association may have been proved positive with a larger sample size Limitation section; this was a very small study. Would change wording in sample size from in “Second,...relatively small” to “small”. Also one sentence does not make sense: “Nonetheless, our study was not lack of sample size to test the hypothesis based on sample size calculation.” Conclusion: would tone down the wording of conclusion, to emphasize the exploratory/pilot nature of the study, e.g. “this limited size study did not disclose an increased complication rate...” Minor Concerns: -it appears that during editing several words has been “merged” together... this is a very annoying issue, and while very easy to fix (review paper “with changes accepted” in Words), certainly should be carefully fixed -in many places I noted the Authors report p values as “ $p=0.000$ ”... while SPSS will certainly print the values so, these should be fixed to e.g. to $P<0.001$ ”, or as applicable.; e.g, noted this issue in Abstract, text and Tables