

# ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 10058

**Title:** Capsule endoscopy in pediatric age: a 10-years journey

**Reviewer code:** 00503575

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-03-11 14:04

**Date reviewed:** 2014-03-24 23:21

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" 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

This manuscript describes the use of wireless video capsule endoscopy for evaluation the esophagus small bowel and the colon. While the topic is of great importance, and of substantial benefit in pediatrics, some issue need to be addressed. Major 1. This review does not cover equally the topic addressed including the use of capsule endoscopy for evaluation the esophagus small bowel and the colon. The authors need to reconsider the extent of covering these issues. In case, as the authors stipulated, less data are available for capsule endoscopy of the esophagus and the colon, the authors may focus mainly on capsule endoscopy of the small bowel with brief mention of the other aspects in a unique paragraph. The present format has a significant disproportion that make the manuscript lose its focus. 2. The manuscript also lack a strength in terms of the novelty used in this techniques. The authors need to put more emphasis on what is new separately. 3. Some numbers are not recognizable and the authors need to verify the accuracy of their calculations. For example: page 5; last paragraph, 101 patients seems not to equal 71.3% out of 162. 4. Some of the citations need to be reconsidered. For example: page 3; last paragraph, the authors cite 21 reference to describe the use of CE. The authors may summarize these conditions and reduce the number of reference to make the reading convenient. In case the other indications are of importance, these information could be cited in details or summarized in a table. Minor a) Page 4; paragraph 4, cleansing should be spelled cleaning b) Page 5; paragraph 4, (86.0%; 95% CI=81.6-89.9%; P=.0003). This sentence need to be reformulated. c) Page 5; paragraph 4, The youngest was age 4 years. This sentence need also to be reformulated. d) Page 6; paragraph 1, In one study, SBCE examination in 1 study... The word study was used twice. This need to be corrected. e) Page 8; last paragraph, Of note, other esophageal and



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [editorialoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:editorialoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

duodenal findings also... In a review, the authors would better describe these findings. f) Page 9, paragraph 3. The authors refers to references 68-61 which did not appear in the list. They may rather want to refer to 58-61. g) Some references need to be completed or cited as "in press". For example ref. 60 and 61.

# ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 10058

**Title:** Capsule endoscopy in pediatric age: a 10-years journey

**Reviewer code:** 02822816

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-03-11 14:04

**Date reviewed:** 2014-03-25 02:05

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)		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

To the authors, Congratulations for this review. There are, however, few grammar and spelling errors which should be corrected, and one or two suggestions listed below: Core tip: second line: SBCE instead of BCE. Abstract: line 9: insufflation instead of insufflations Last line: population instead of populations Page 6, first paragraph, second sentence: "In one study, SBCE examination in 1 study....", please, rewrite! Page7, second paragraph, line 12: "of 1.4%, 2.3%, and 1.2%, respectively" please indicate reference. Please, see also the higher incidence of capsule retention in other studies in adults (eg, Singeap AM et al, Eur J Gastroenterol and Hepatol, 2011, 10). Page 9, colon capsule, second paragraph, second sentence:58-61 instead of 68-61 Page 9, I suggest Conclusion instead of Summary Please, read carefully the Format for references and make corrections throughout the text. Take care at style for journal references (the first author should be typed in bold/faced letters, all authors should be included etc.), PMID and DOI requirements etc. Finally, do you have permission from the authors/journal to reproduce Table 1? If yes, please make corrections in legend.



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

### ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 10058

**Title:** Capsule endoscopy in pediatric age: a 10-years journey

**Reviewer code:** 02530731

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-03-11 14:04

**Date reviewed:** 2014-04-11 22:03

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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	<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

This is a clear and concise review about capsule endoscopy in pediatric patients. It is very useful for the readers to have such a review. I have no criticism. I suggest acceptance.

**ESPS Peer-review Report****Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 10058**Title:** Capsule endoscopy in pediatric age: a 10-years journey**Reviewer code:** 00039316**Science editor:** Yuan Qi**Date sent for review:** 2014-03-11 14:04**Date reviewed:** 2014-05-01 17:29

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

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The manuscript entitled "Capsule endoscopy in pediatric age: a 10-years journey" is a comprehensive Review of the subject written from a GROUP that has published on this topic. Authors must address the following issues in order to improve the manuscript. 1. Present the patients outcomes and adverse events in tables. Include also a table that summarizes the differences of capsule endoscopy use between adults and pediatrics. Include indications, preparation, adverse events, etc. 2. What do the P values stand for in pages 10 ( $P=0.003$  &  $<0.0001$ ), 13 (0.4247) and 14 (0.6014)? There are no comparisons! 3. What do the 3 risks stand for in page 12; Absolute risks, relative (to what) risks? 4. Something is missing in the last sentence of page 16. It is meaningless. 5. Last Line, page 17. Consider changing "have established" with "proposed". This is the meaning of the ESGE guideline 6. Regarding bowel preparation for capsule endoscopy. There are 2 meta-analysis that established the role of purgative bowel preparation to improve even the diagnostic yield of capsule endoscopy. Therefore, I propose to delete references 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37 and include - discuss the meta-analysis of Rokkas et al. and Niv et al that included the aforementioned papers. 7. Have the authors obtained permission to use the data in Table 1? 8. Page 13, one Line before the last. Does age  $18.8 \pm 0.9$  years represent a pediatric population? 9. There is no conflict of interest statement 10. English needs improvement. You can hardly find flow in the text, since each section is presented as a group of statements.