

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7424

Title: Sedated vs. Unsedated Colonoscopy: a prospective study

Reviewer code: 00028188

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-11-18 13:56

Date reviewed: 2013-11-18 16:50

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 methodologically flawed paper I'm afraid. This needed to be done as a sham controller RCT giving saline versus conventional sedation. Instead the authors simply asked patients whether they wanted sedation or not making the results uninterpretable as the amount of bias introduced is enormous - those willing to consider not having sedation are a completely different cohort of patient in many ways. Furthermore no attempt was made to control the subjects in the two groups for age, sex, comorbidity, indication for test etc etc etc. Also no details are given to the reader as to whether one or several endoscopists were used in the study - assuming it is the latter, the results are even more difficult to interpret. No power calculation was done so I am not clear why they chose to recruit 403 patients?

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7424

Title: Sedated vs. Unsedated Colonoscopy: a prospective study

Reviewer code: 00504704

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-11-18 13:56

Date reviewed: 2013-11-19 12:00

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

Well written and interesting. Comments The report describes what seems to be poor endoscopy technique. 85% cecal intubation is very low. It should be 95 to 99%. The polypectomy rate is incredibly low (2%). It suggests that perhaps one could even get better pain scores and higher patient satisfaction from more proficient endoscopists. This should be discussed. The cohort of patients is also unusual. The indication for examination is not listed. The average age at colonoscopy seems low (45 yrs). The authors should provide indications for procedure in a table. Finally, the 5- year recommended interval for repeat colonoscopy (page 9) does not appear to follow standard society guidelines based on the very low polypectomy rate unless this was a cohort with strong family history of cancer.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7424

Title: Sedated vs. Unsedated Colonoscopy: a prospective study

Reviewer code: 00061678

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-11-18 13:56

Date reviewed: 2013-11-20 00:12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Editor, Authors Thank you for sending the manuscript "Sedated vs. Unsedated Colonoscopy: a prospective study" for revision. Please accept the following comments: - Same work repeatedly done in other search papers, no novelty otherwise it can reflect local experience. - well organised methodology. - well written Thanks