

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 87579

**Title:** Propofol sedation in routine endoscopy: A case series comparing target controlled infusion vs. manually controlled bolus concept

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00068348

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Surgeon

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-08-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu (Quit 2023)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-09-07 21:10

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-09-08 20:09

**Review time:** 22 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The sedation of patients undergoing endoscopy is a major issue for both the patient and the doctor. The study is well organized. Number of patients is adequate. It may be useful to describe a bit more the adverse effects of propofol. The conclusion is very useful for gastroenterologists since the reduction of complications due to propofol is crucial.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 87579

**Title:** Propofol sedation in routine endoscopy: A case series comparing target controlled infusion vs. manually controlled bolus concept

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02897448

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Chief Doctor, Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-08-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-08-21 05:56

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-09-11 03:08

**Review time:** 20 Days and 21 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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Summary: The study's objective is to assess safety and performance of propofol TCI sedation in comparison with nurse-administered bolus-sedation. Based on initial analysis, the manuscript is important, but has a limited innovation. Additionally, the manuscript is not well organized and presented, and the accuracy needs to be improved. A few major issues need to be addressed before final decision. Therefore, the paper is suggested to "major revisions". Main comments: 1. There are some spelling problems in the manuscript. For example, the "Mai 2017" in line 28 should be corrected to "May 2017", and "Hoever" should be modified to "However" in line 194. Please review the manuscript carefully and make the necessary corrections to ensure its accuracy. 2. In study cohort, the experimental group is "prospective" and the control group is "retrospective", it is better to keep the cohort setting consistent. Comparison of historical data requires more statistical analysis, but this is not well represented in this paper. 3. The number of decimal places to be retained should be the same for the data in the Table 1. 4. In Figure 1, the box-and-line plots lacked horizontal coordinates, the corresponding groups were not clearly labeled, and the differences in the relevant statistical analyses were not well labeled. 5. The level of the Table 2 is ambiguous, and since it is intended to show the percentage of the total number of adverse events, it should be clearly spelled out. Additionally, consistency in the number of decimal places to be retained. 6. In Table 3, the TCI group required fewer doses than the control group at longer examination times but there was no statistical difference. In addition, it was divided by examination time alone, without considering specific examination procedures and related adjustments. 7. In Figure 2, do a linear fit of dosage per minute



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

to sedation time? Which endoscopy specifically? Which seems too vague, and if it's a total data analysis of all endoscopies, how should the inclusion/comparability criteria be adjusted? Which is not clear. 8. There were some issues with the references, including confusing order of citations. Please check the references carefully and make the necessary corrections. 9. According to the criteria checklist for new manuscript peer-review, the title and abstract effectively reflected the work of the manuscript, and the method was comprehensively described. The research results achieved the objectives of the study, and the discussion was relatively clear. However, the figures, tables, and decimal points used in the manuscript were inaccurate, leading to inadequate organization and quality of the manuscript. Conclusion: In conclusion, it is believed that the paper has the potential to make a good contribution to the journal; however, several major issues must be addressed before publication. Therefore, it is recommended that the author should revise the manuscript accordingly and resubmit it for further consideration.