



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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 16505

Title: Is there an easy way to check the detection rate of colon polyps?: A simple colonoscopy reporting system

Reviewer's code: 03003381

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-01-21 22:04

Date reviewed: 2015-02-02 22:08

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper deals with a simple colonoscopy reporting system that can facilitate the automatic analysis of colonoscopy quality indicators. This system may be useful for performing colonoscopy research and improving the quality of colonoscopy, but I have some comments. My major comments are as follows. 1) The authors referred to other colonoscopy reporting system (EndoALPHA) reported by van Doom in 2014. What is difference between KG Quality reporting system and EndoALPHA? In particular, explanation for the cost-effectiveness of KG reporting system should be provided. 2) Each facility has its own endoscopy reporting system. Is it technically easy to introduce KG reporting system to other gastroenterology center? I hope these comments will be helpful.



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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 16505

Title: Is there an easy way to check the detection rate of colon polyps?: A simple colonoscopy reporting system

Reviewer's code: 00028630

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-01-21 22:04

Date reviewed: 2015-03-13 01:11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The topic is interesting, even if the article will have little impact on the activity of the readers, as the software is not commercially available. The article is well written and I have only minor comments: 1) METHODS. I suggest the Authors to delete the section "Training": it is useless 2) DISCUSSION. I suggest the Authors to compare their colonoscopy reporting system with other reporting systems in the literature (for example reference N. 8)