

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6774

Title: YouTube as a source of patient information on gallstone disease

Reviewer code: 02527871

Science editor: Cui, Xue-Mei

Date sent for review: 2013-10-30 10:40

Date reviewed: 2013-11-14 15:19

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)		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript titled with "YouTube as a source of patient information on gallstone disease" is very interesting and useful for common people. And it is also a very good advice to the video websites such as YouTube, but it is really useless for the journal readers with professional medical knowledge. Therefore, it is not recommended for publication in WJG journal.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6774

Title: YouTube as a source of patient information on gallstone disease

Reviewer code: 02822992

Science editor: Cui, Xue-Mei

Date sent for review: 2013-10-30 10:40

Date reviewed: 2013-11-23 05:43

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	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The current study is a review of videos shown on YouTube on the topic of gallbladder disease. The findings show that a significant portion of videos are misleading to viewers and that low quality videos are more frequently distributed by commercial entities. The study provides an interesting topic with clinical significance due to an increasing number of online resources utilized by patients. Yet, it is sometimes hard to read and does need some editorial help. Since the study design is very straight forward, the overall manuscript length could also be shortened. From a study design perspective, I would suggest to have more than two reviewers perform the review. Since the scoring system is subjective with a limited number of videos, observational biases are prone. The risk for biases could significantly be reduced by increasing the number of reviewers. I would also emphasize the findings that commercial entities were no better than civilians, suggesting that commercial entities may not have performed any research on the topic prior to posting the video.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6774

Title: YouTube as a source of patient information on gallstone disease

Reviewer code: 00057983

Science editor: Cui, Xue-Mei

Date sent for review: 2013-10-30 10:40

Date reviewed: 2013-11-28 00:48

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	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study points out an important issue of medical knowledge source to the public. However, I have the following comments. First, the authors searched one hundred videos under the assumption that the user would not go beyond the first five pages of search results. However, we should know the priority of relevance might be affected by advertisement cause of video up-loaders of YouTube system. So this might cause some bias. Second, please explain why you choose YouTube as a source of medical information for analysis. In general condition, most people should use the SEARCH ENGINE to search the website with objective explanation and discussion first, esp. the information from some medical centers. Third, this study is a relatively good design. However, I suggest the authors should invite a native English to revise the manuscript before being considered for publication.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6774

Title: YouTube as a source of patient information on gallstone disease

Reviewer code: 02495743

Science editor: Cui, Xue-Mei

Date sent for review: 2013-10-30 10:40

Date reviewed: 2013-11-28 17:05

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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A very nice article. I have only two points I would like you to comment on: - As I understand, both researchers who did the evaluation of the videos were from the same department, right? So the Chance is high that both of them follow the same local "school" with a certain own view on ethiology and treatment of gallbladder stones and usefulness of the content of these videos. The very high kappa value reflects that. Choosing reviewers from different departments not directly related to each other, maybe from different countries or continents would have been interesting. I would like to ask you to make a comment on this issue in the limitations section. - Can you define a goldstandard that you regarded as the absolute truth or the ultimate arbitrator for the ethiology, treatment and so on of gallbladder stone disease? Something like a societie's official guideline or a renown textbook like Harrison's internal medicine?