



ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14260

Title: Visual distraction alone for the improvement of colonoscopy-related pain and satisfaction: a randomized controlled study

Reviewer code: 00722674

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2014-09-29 13:10

Date reviewed: 2014-10-23 06:44

Table with 4 columns: CLASSIFICATION, LANGUAGE EVALUATION, RECOMMENDATION, CONCLUSION. It lists various criteria like Grade A (Excellent), Grade B (Very good), etc., and corresponding actions like 'Accept', 'High priority for publication', etc.

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, Congratulations on your work. I really enjoyed this article and I think it will be interesting for many professionals of the field. Overall it is an interesting well performed and written study. Here s my comments: 1) Based on what assumptions, sample size was 60 patients? 2) Is VAS a sound method for assessing patient satisfaction or anxiety after procedures? Is there relevant literature? In the case of satisfaction what is the meaning of 100% (the best satisfaction after procedures? what if that was their first procedure?) 3) Primary endpoints were used to calculate sample size of the study? Otherwise what is the meaning of define them as primary endpoints? 4) How did the ensure that wearing the bulky device w/o the silent movie did not have the oposite effects (i.e. increasing anxiety) and thus bias significantly the results? 5) Having noticed that the device is black, i wonder if the patients w/o movie could see clearly through it or it it was dark. Having a colonoscopy in dark may also increase your anxiety particularly if you nobody talks to you and knowing that you missed the potential benefit of a funny movie. 6) Two thirds of the patients have had previous colonoscopy. This is very high. How do the authors define "elective colonoscopy for screening". Obviously patients with previous experiences have less anxiety. 7) Regarding the inclusion criteria: "attending a non-sedated screening colonoscopy" means that patients had agreed to do the endoscopy w/o sedation and if they required sedation finally they were excluded? If this is the case, then this could have introduced bias. 8) Regarding the



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>

exclusion criteria. Personal history of anxiety or psychiatric disorders is essential, as well as chronic pain disorders (i.e. polymyalgia) 9) For the procedural time minutes are more meaningful than seconds. 10) "Lembo et al. [24] investigated whether audio and visual distractions reduced discomfort during a flexible sigmoidoscopy. Pls correct sigmoidoscopy 11) In the limitations section of the discussion more sources of bias should be included, some of them already mentioned above. 12) Please explain in Table 1: "Number of times" 13) Explain IQR 14) Table 2. Pls use minutes rather than seconds and explain IQR. 15) Table 2. Third column. Some ranges are missing. 16) Table 3,4. Pls define IQR Sincerely.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14260

Title: Visual distraction alone for the improvement of colonoscopy-related pain and satisfaction: a randomized controlled study

Reviewer code: 00494239

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2014-09-29 13:10

Date reviewed: 2014-10-02 15:06

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"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript revealed that visual distraction alone improves satisfaction in patients undergoing colonoscopy and decreases anxiety and pain during the procedure among patients with a high pre-procedural anxiety score. The work has good study design, well-performance, and constructive findings, but some points need further clarification Major 1. In statistical method, why do the authors use median rather than mean and standard deviation in Table 1-4, including age. 2. In Table 1, What is IQR ? what is number of times ? in Table 2, why the group 2 did not show range in each parameter? 3. The insertion depth (length) when the scopy reached cecum is also an important factor for pain sensation, you should have the data of the insertion depth (length) in your study and showed them in Table 2 4. The parameters of Table 2, such as cecal insertion rate, time to reach, time needed for total procedure should be demonstrated in Table 4-patients with higher anxiety score. Minor 1. In the Discussion, page 15, the descriptions "Among the responses to the questionnaire conducted after the procedure, the patients reported that animations, sports videos, landscape films, or images of their own endoscopy would be useful for relaxing." was suggested to be removed. They do not have tested yet. 2. How much is the equipment of head-mounted display (MOVERIO EPSON?; SEIKO EPSON CORPORATION, Nagano Japan) ? Is it available in most country in the world ?



ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14260

Title: Visual distraction alone for the improvement of colonoscopy-related pain and satisfaction: a randomized controlled study

Reviewer code: 01427092

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2014-09-29 13:10

Date reviewed: 2014-10-08 02:20

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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

This randomized control trial demonstrated that visual distraction alone improved satisfaction in patients who were undergoing screening colonoscopy. The authors concluded that visual distraction alone improves satisfaction and decreases anxiety and pain during the colonoscopy especially in patients with great anxiety. This is well written study and novel information, but with some limitations in the following areas. Major 1. The results in the high pre-procedure anxiety group are based on few patients and a p value of 0.04-0.05 is of questionable statistical significance in this setting. The authors should add this point to the limitation of this study. Minor 1. Table1-4. What is IQR? Add explanation. 2. Table2. Authors should show the range data of patients in group2.