



**ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT**

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 12975

**Title:** The Effect of pronase as mucolytic agent on imaging quality of magnifying endoscopy

**Reviewer code:** 01330502

**Science editor:** Su-Xin Gou

**Date sent for review:** 2014-07-31 14:47

**Date reviewed:** 2014-08-08 15:34

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 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 checked="" 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**

Authors concluded that premedication with the proteolytic enzyme pronase improved the quality of magnifying endoscopic images and required fewer water flushes to achieve satisfactory endoscopic viewing. Although this paper is an interesting topic, this paper needs several additional changes which I feel addressing.

1. Authors showed a significant difference in the median visibility score of magnifying endoscopy between group A and B. However, no significant difference in the endoscopic procedure time was observed between two groups. In addition, most of patients needed less than four water flushes to clean up their stomach. When we interpret their results, oral premedication with pronase is useful for having better mucosal visibility during conventional endoscopy. If they evaluate in the magnifying endoscopy, the endoscopists should directly use water flushes with pronase to the lesions which were needed magnifying observation.
2. Two experienced endoscopists evaluated the mucosal visibility grade during endoscopy. As described in the discussion section, intra or inter observer variability may exist. Authors should show the inter- and intra-observer agreement of the endoscopists.
3. Authors described that this study was designed as a prospective, randomized, double blind study in the method section. They should explain how the studied patients were randomized.



# 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:** 12975

**Title:** The Effect of pronase as mucolytic agent on imaging quality of magnifying endoscopy

**Reviewer code:** 02445653

**Science editor:** Su-Xin Gou

**Date sent for review:** 2014-07-31 14:47

**Date reviewed:** 2014-08-09 23:48

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	<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

The study characteristics/logistics should be clearly stated, not only for presentation improvement, but to assist any future attempts for systematic reviews/meta-analyses. Although inter observer agreement -or indeed disagreement- between only 2 persons (endoscopists/reviewers etc) is not that solid, your manuscript would be greatly enhanced by some Kappa stats. Please consider combining table 2 and 3 to one. Good luck with your submission.