

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 7586

Title: How to achieve the best possible bowel preparation for colonoscopy?

Reviewer code: 00831621

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2013-11-26 15:24

Date reviewed: 2013-12-10 07:31

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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Bowel preparation for colonoscopy is a central issue related to quality of colonoscopy. In this review, the authors reviewed the most frequently used agents, and also the new agents and combinations. Moreover, certain considerations are taken into account in special populations in order to improve safety, efficacy and tolerance. Preparations in pediatric patients, in heart or kidney failure, diabetics, in those with inflammatory bowel disease, and in lower gastrointestinal bleeding, are also discussed. Finally, the preparation methods applied by a Japanese expert colonoscopist are described. However, the title of this review is "How to achieve the best possible bowel preparation for colonoscopy". I noticed that the review is too lengthy and general, even the summary. It should be more specific and focused. Unfortunately, I did not see they talked much about what the best possible bowel preparation for colonoscopy is. I think they should cut lots of the general contents, more focus on their title, and make the review more specific and concise.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 7586

Title: How to achieve the best possible bowel preparation for colonoscopy?

Reviewer code: 00158379

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2013-11-26 15:24

Date reviewed: 2014-01-19 16:33

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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article is a review article on bowel preparation for colonoscopy, the authors try to summarize different methods for bowel preparation in the clinical daily practice at present. It is interesting and provide readers important information. However, several problems should be clarified and addressed before accepting for publication. 1. The article is too lengthy and repetitive, should be more concise. 2. Different methods are mentioned, however readers still don't know which is the best bowel preparation for colonoscopy. 3. Different methods are mentioned, authors should compare their advantages and disadvantages, it would be better to have a comparison table. 4. Tables 1 and 2 are clumsy and lengthy, difficult to read and understand. 5. Article structure and paragraph format should be rearranged. The present format is difficult to read: 1) Traditional methods for bowel preparation: PEG and NAP..... 2) Low-volume solutions (table 2) 3) Facts about timing of bowel preparation 4) Facts about diet 5) Facts about information 6) Alternative methods of bowel preparation 7) Bowel preparation in IBD Alternatives for bowel preparation in IBD a) Active IBD setting b) Severe active IBD c) Colonic cancer surveillance in IBD patients d) Small bowel studies e) Therapeutic IBD procedures 8) Preparation in special patients Bowel preparation in the elderly Bowel preparation in diabetics Bowel preparation in patients with renal failure 9) Bowel preparation for pediatric patients 10) Bowel preparation for lower GI bleeding 11) Bowel preparation in Japan Example: 9) Pediatric patients do not considered as special patients in (8) ? Try to discuss and compare different preparations in different patients by using tables, such as in special



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

patients. 6. Why the authors mentioned the experience of a Japanese clinic? Does it represent the current clinical practice model in Japan? How the clinic was chosen? Should inform the readers the background of this clinic. 7. Would like to know the relationship and background of the authors. They were from different countries including Chile, Spain and Japan. 8. Too many grammatical and spelling errors.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 7586

Title: How to achieve the best possible bowel preparation for colonoscopy?

Reviewer code: 00004982

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2013-11-26 15:24

Date reviewed: 2013-12-03 11:00

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the present review, the author described bowel preparation for colonoscopy. Preparations in pediatric patients, in heart or kidney failure, diabetics, in those with inflammatory bowel disease, and in lower gastrointestinal bleeding, are discussed. The topic is important, however, the review is relatively too long. It would be better to write more concisely and focus on preparations in several diseases.