

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28957

**Title:** Use of the Endocuff during routine colonoscopy examination improves adenoma detection: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 03647783

**Reviewer's country:** Germany

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-25 12:51

**Date reviewed:** 2016-08-19 20:02

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 checked="" 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 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

In their article "Use of the Endocuff during routine colonoscopy examination improves adenoma detection: A meta-analysis, Chin et al. perform a meta-analysis of nine studies with 5624 patients to compare endocuff assisted colonoscopy with standard colonoscopy. The article is very well written and of special interest as methods helping to improve adenoma detection during colonoscopy are desired. Comments: p.3: The authors state that the adenoma detection rate (ADR) is indirectly proportional to a patient's risk of developing an interval cancer. It would be correct to state that ADR correlates inversely to the risk of interval cancer. p.6: The authors should provide a comment on the study quality of included studies which they have assessed using the Effective Public Health Practice Project model. p.8: The authors might add that loss of the device occurred only in one study (did this have an influence on the procedure during which this complication occurred? Did this complication not occur in other studies?). p.9/Discussion: The authors did not comment on funnel plot to assess potential publication bias. They should also comment potential publication bias because of excluding studies published in foreign language (n=7). p.9/Discussion: Procedures were performed for varies



## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

indications, therefore the overall performance of the endocuff in solely screening colonoscopies remains to be investigated further. Table 1: The article by Biecker et al. was published in 2015 and not in 2014 as stated in the table. Table 1: The mean cecal intubation time is probably not displayed correctly for Ref 17 and 21.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28957

**Title:** Use of the Endocuff during routine colonoscopy examination improves adenoma detection: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 00031150

**Reviewer's country:** Germany

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-25 12:51

**Date reviewed:** 2016-09-01 01:16

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a nice meta-analysis on EAC. 1) However, the size of adenomas detected is missing. But it is important to know these data, as small or diminutive polyps (<5 mm) almost never will progress to carcinomas. 2) No data are given about the costs of the device. this is also important to know, as the insurance companies do not refund the hospitals or practices for the costs of this single use device.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28957

**Title:** Use of the Endocuff during routine colonoscopy examination improves adenoma detection: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 00071725

**Reviewer's country:** Singapore

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-25 12:51

**Date reviewed:** 2016-09-04 11:13

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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 is a reasonable review of the Endocuff and the methodology is clearly stated and acceptable. The choice of the studies are however quite heterogenous and the article may be improved if the authors can address this issue more both in the methodology and discussion. May be helpful to have figures showing the difference in the endoscopic view with and without the Endocuff

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28957

**Title:** Use of the Endocuff during routine colonoscopy examination improves adenoma detection: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 00068666

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-25 12:51

**Date reviewed:** 2016-09-06 00:58

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Congratulations you made a good study