

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 34814

Title: Bacterial presence on flexible endoscopes versus time since disinfection

Reviewer's code: 00503404

Reviewer's country: Canada

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-07-18

Date reviewed: 2017-07-18

Review time: 2 Hours

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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 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"/> [Y] 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"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The aim of the paper is interesting and important for the practice. Authors took a nice approach, results are important for the practice. Comments; 1. A possible limitation of the study is that generalizability of the study to other disinfection protocols and molecules is limited and questionable. 2. Authors could comment that actually higher number of scopes were positive after a short hanging duration. Accepting small numbers, please comment if this is still important for the clinical practice? 3. Please comment more the 200cfu /mL cut-off, seeing the results is this still the recommendation for endoscopes as well, acceptable, or should be lower?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 34814

Title: Bacterial presence on flexible endoscopes versus time since disinfection

Reviewer's code: 03474684

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-08-04

Date reviewed: 2017-08-16

Review time: 12 Days

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors the study is well written. Study with similar results have been published by your group in Endoscopy journal 2007. Would you kindly elaborate the similarities and differences; if any, between both these studies. As repetition of similar results may not impress the readers. Thank you Best Regards

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 34814

Title: Bacterial presence on flexible endoscopes versus time since disinfection

Reviewer's code: 01799104

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-08-21

Date reviewed: 2017-08-30

Review time: 9 Days

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 checked="" 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		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript concludes that reprocessing the endoscope is not necessary when they left in a ventilated, dust free cabinet, no matter stored from 1 to 7 days. Indeed, it is time saving and less endoscopes damage. Two minor issues are suggested. First, I don't think that named colonoscopy CHD4 is necessary because it will confuse the readers. You may mention one colonoscopy instead of CHD4. Secondly, there may be incorrect title for x-axis of figure 2. It should be "Colony Forming Units (x 10)".