

**ESPS Peer-review Report**
**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8099

**Title:** Randomized controlled trial of sodium phosphate tablets versus PEG solution for colonoscopy bowel cleansing

**Reviewer code:** 00061678

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-16 11:23

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-21 01:11

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

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Dear Authors Thanks for sending the manuscript "Randomized controlled trial of sodium phosphate tablets versus PEG solution for colonoscopy bowel cleansing" for revision -Idea of the paper repeatedly done in search work. - well written - figure and tables are well organized

# ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8099

**Title:** Randomized controlled trial of sodium phosphate tablets versus PEG solution for colonoscopy bowel cleansing

**Reviewer code:** 00188264

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-16 11:23

**Date reviewed:** 2014-01-14 03:05

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 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 checked="" 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

Dr. Jung and others wanted to compare the bowel cleansing efficacy of newer formulation of NaP tablets (COLICOLOM) manufactured in Korea claimed to be smaller, lighter and disintegrate more quickly than US FDA approved Osmoprep tablets , to PEG solution using a none inferiority randomized study design. Authors found equal efficacy between the two regimens with regards to bowel cleansing but NaP tablets to be better tolerated and preferred. - This study didn't add any new knowledge, multiple studies and multiple meta-analyses have shown the same exact result. Yes Nap is as effective as 4L PEG solution and better tolerated but its use is limited by the side effects and its recommended to be used as an alternative to PEG solution in carefully selected group of people (young, healthy with no co morbidities) which is exactly what this study showed.

# ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8099

**Title:** Randomized controlled trial of sodium phosphate tablets versus PEG solution for colonoscopy bowel cleansing

**Reviewer code:** 01714224

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-16 11:23

**Date reviewed:** 2014-01-25 20:13

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

# COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper reports a study by Yoon Suk Jung et al. comparing NaP (sodium phosphate anhydrous/monohydrate) tablets versus standard polyethylene glycol solution for bowel cleansing before screening colonoscopy. The paper is well written but some criticisms may be made. As the same Authors claim in Discussion, an important point when a phosphate-based preparation is used for colonoscopy is the possible occurrence of electrolytic changes which may lead to serious side effects in some patients, such as those affected by cardiovascular diseases, renal impairment and other conditions. In order to limit the occurrence of serious adverse events, study population excluded patients with known or possibly having (aged >60) risky conditions as well as inpatients, due to comorbidities. Thus, data emerging from the investigation refer to a selected population comprising only relatively young (aged <60) healthy subjects undergoing colonoscopy for screening. Correctly, Authors conclude Discussion stating that bowel preparation with NaP tablets is safe, well-tolerated, and efficient in healthy individuals without comorbidity. Authors should also add in this statement the relatively young age of patients (<60). Features of patients should be specified (healthy individuals aged <60 undergoing morning screening colonoscopy) also in the section Patients and Methods of Abstract. Taking into account characteristics of study population and the lack of assessment of electrolytic balance before and after bowel preparation, which limits a full information regarding tolerability, Authors should highlight in Discussion that the study setting is adequate to demonstrate that NaP tablets preparation is effective to determine a good bowel cleansing and is well accepted while does not furnish sufficient data to reach definite conclusions



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, United States

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com) <http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

regarding tolerability and safety in general population. Minor criticisms Patients and Methods: Study population: - What is the period of study? From December 2012 to October 2013? The sentence is not clear, please modify. - What does mean "non specific symptoms"? Do authors mean absence of a known disease, for example an inflammatory bowel disease, or symptoms of alarm (rectal, bleeding, etc.?) Please clarify. - Bowel preparation: have agents for bowel cleansing been dispensed by research center or prescribed and acquired by patients in form of marketed packages? 2. Evaluation of patient compliance, acceptability, satisfaction, and safety: no information is furnished regarding in which way the safety has been evaluated or defined: on the basis of serious adverse events? Some English (for example, difference instead different in Page 8, line 20, etc.) or typewriting (for example Clicolom instead Clicolon, page 9, line 17) errors have to be corrected in the text.