

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

**Manuscript NO:** 80757

**Title:** Effectiveness of early colonoscopy in patients with colonic diverticular hemorrhage: A single-center retrospective cohort study

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00504462

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** AGAF, FACG, FACP, MD

**Professional title:** Associate Specialist, N/A

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Mexico

**Author's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-11

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-10-13 19:58

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-10-16 20:01

**Review time:** 3 Days

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Sir, It was an impressive work for a long length of time. Your results are impressive, however, it should be addressed some details that you need to revise: a) There are some concepts and words that can cause some confusion as "underwent early colonoscopy due to shock vital after hospitalization were also excluded to avoid immortal time bias."¿? and "creatinine under 1.5 mg/dL was defined as chronic kidney disease" ¿? b) You analyzed two groups of 191 patients, however, into your tables you included a table where you included as well, all patients before the propensity score matching analysis. Why did you do that? And if you did that, why did not you included both groups into the table 2 and 3? And how and what criteria did you used to exclude 66 patients from each group? c) You do mention the rebleeding cases, but were there mortality cases in these groups? How long time did you performed the follow up after the hospital discharge? Did you have more rebleeding cases or mortality cases? Even thought they were not related to diverticular bleeding? Please let us know your answers in order to make a more profound analysis of your interesting manuscript. Sincerely

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

**Manuscript NO:** 80757

**Title:** Effectiveness of early colonoscopy in patients with colonic diverticular hemorrhage: A single-center retrospective cohort study

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02468626

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-11

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-10-12 07:16

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-10-23 20:19

**Review time:** 11 Days and 13 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors presented a large study on the outcomes of colonoscopy after diverticular bleeding. The study is well conducted and well written. It is one of the largest studies on the topic. Main remarks 1) Exclusion criteria. I do not understand what "Patients with missing measurements" are. Please rephrase. 2) Exclusion criteria. Why "patients who underwent early colonoscopy due to shock vital after hospitalization" were excluded? What is shock vital? Also, please try to explain the meaning of immortal time bias. 3) I do not see the reason for calling "shock vitality" shock index >1. I suggest to just call it shock index >1 to avoid misunderstanding. 4) 1-2 endoscopic pictures showing stigmata of diverticular bleeding should be included.