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: 20679
Title: A systematic review of endoscopy in neutropenic and/or thrombocytopenic patients
Reviewer's code: 02723208
Reviewer's country: Italy
Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma
Date sent for review: 2015-06-19 09:00
Date reviewed: 2015-07-04 11:12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[Y] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The topic investigated in this article is really interesting. Nevertheless studies included in this "systematic review" are very different in design and endpoints. The quality of available data is poor and it is very difficult (or impossible) to analyze them in a rigid framework, such as a metanalysis, or even a systematic review. I agree about the fact that the authors used a systematic protocol to identify articles pertinent to their topic. Nevertheless the question(s) investigated in a systematic review should be clearly focused and the review should include a meaningful evaluation of the quality of the available evidence. I think that the Authors should include in the Methods section a more precise description of the question(s) they are investigating and the type of the data they are appraising from original articles. Furthermore I agree with the Authors that in the case of their review, a large part of the methodological recommendations included in a document such as the PRISMA checklist could not be fulfilled; nevertheless the Authors should disclose the reasons in the discussion section. Thus I suggest to the Authors to resubmit the article after revision.

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: 20679
Title: A systematic review of endoscopy in neutropenic and/or thrombocytopenic patients
Reviewer's code: 00056678
Reviewer's country: France
Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma
Date sent for review: 2015-06-19 09:00
Date reviewed: 2015-06-30 00:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript ? A systematic review of endoscopy in neutropenic and/or thrombocytopenic patients ? reports the different adverts events in patients with thrombocytopeny and neutropeny after endoscopic treatment. The adverts are mainly hemorhaege and septic complications. The authors have to expose the results of the studies with percentage of adverts. In page 10, ? In study by Buderus et al. ? ought to be changed to ? In Burderus's study ?. They also ought to explain the abbreviations in the text (ITP/TTP, ANC…). ? Not infrequently ? has to be corrected. They also need to add the DOI in the references. The manuscript is clear but the article would be even clearer if the data of table 3 and table 4 were included in the same table.