



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 87725

Title: Bowel preparation protocol for hospitalized patients ages 50 years or older: A randomized controlled trial

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03262675

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Sweden

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-26

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-10-09 06:12

Reviewer performed review: 2023-10-17 12:44

Review time: 8 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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 Grade E: Do not publish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



Scientific significance of the conclusion in 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 scientific significance
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 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
Peer-reviewer statements	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

This manuscript describes a single centre single blinded randomised controlled trial regarding bowel preparation before colonoscopy among hospitalised patients. The study is powered for and include a subgroups evaluation of patients aged 75 years and above. Treatment allocation groups are standard bowel preparation compared to a regimen with half the amount of poyethylenglycol but with the addition of a specific diet and lactulose. The manuscript is generally well written, and the study methodology adheres to modern standards. Preparation of the manuscript follows the Consort protocol. Outcome data from the study are encouraging revealing several advantages for the patient by us of the “experimental” intervention. I have however a few suggestions that hopefully will further improve the manuscript: 1. Please provide a more detailed description of the randomisation process. 2. The randomisation process resulted in a somewhat surprising imbalance between the two treatment allocations. Please explain why in the Discussion section. 3. The “experimental” treatment allocation resulted in an almost 10% (the effect limit for the entire study group) difference for the main outcome variable among the most vulnerable patients - the right colon among those



**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

aged 75 years and above. Please problematise this finding further in the Discussion section. 4. In many western countries I assume a varying proportion of the included patients would have been treated as outpatient cases. Please add some comments regarding applicability for the “experimental” regimen.