

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 12276

**Title:** An endoscopic lesion measurement system can improve the accuracy accuracy of endoscopic polyp size measurement

**Reviewer code:** 00742022

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-06-30 18:51

**Date reviewed:** 2014-07-01 05:56

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 checked="" 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 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

An endoscopic lesion measurement system can improve the accuracy accuracy of endoscopic polyp size measurement The investigators have compared a new technique versus standard to grade endoscopic polyp size. They find significant differences between the old and new methods. This is potentially a compelling study. However, there must be some improvements. The English needs vast improvement. To do this, I recommend that the manuscript should be polished by an English linguist or an English language service could be used. Details of author-pays services can be found, for example, at: <http://www.proof-reading-service.com/> or <http://webshop.elsevier.com/languageediting/>. There are problems with punctuation, phraseology, and spelling. To better understand the paper, this must be done first. The authors may also want to add more tables to show all data. All data that is discussed should also be in tabular form. I would actually like to see all the data for all cases too. When they write  $p = 0.000$  it should be  $p < 0.001$ . The word 'accuracy' is repeated in the title. In the Abstract they write 'poly' instead of 'polyp' in one place. They use the word 'different' when they mean 'difference'. There are many problems like this.

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 12276

**Title:** An endoscopic lesion measurement system can improve the accuracy accuracy of endoscopic polyp size measurement

**Reviewer code:** 00041963

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-06-30 18:51

**Date reviewed:** 2014-07-10 03:25

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 checked="" 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 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

1. In the title "accuracy" was written as duplicate. 2. In abstract section, conclusion part in first sentence poly should change to polyp and the sentence should change as ....for polyp size is small than actual size. 3. In materials and methods section; The study's ethical approval was mentioned two times. It must be mentioned beginning of the section only one time. 4. The authors should explain how they calculate the sample size. The power analysis should be done. I think the authors should include more patients to calculate more powerful statistical analysis. 5. How many endoscopists did examine the patients and their experience (year) should be explained in method section. 6. Figure 2 and 3 are not clear. They should be arranged again.

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 12276

**Title:** An endoscopic lesion measurement system can improve the accuracy accuracy of endoscopic polyp size measurement

**Reviewer code:** 00183658

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-06-30 18:51

**Date reviewed:** 2014-07-15 13:19

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

The article from China is aim to establish an endoscopic lesion measurement system (ELMS) and to study of accuracy of endoscopic polyp size measurement. The title is "An endoscopic lesion measurement system can improve the accuracy of endoscopic polyp size measurement". There have some questions and unclear issues. The authors should be clarified and be added the following issues in the text. 1. The study is a low sample size. Some limitations might be occurred. 2. Although, there was statistically significantly different between the visual estimation and the others. The clinical significance might not be occurred. 3. This technique needed a special tool. Unfortunately, the authors did not show the cost-effectiveness. 4. The clinical application of the study is very important. The authors should to be recommended the readers to apply this knowledge into routine clinical practice. Thank you so much