

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4175

Title: POST-ANAESTHETIC DISCHARGE SCORING SYSTEM FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF PATIENT RECOVERY AND DISCHARGE AFTER COLONOSCOPY PERFORMED UNDER SEDATION. A PROSPECTIVE STUDY

Reviewer code: 00028188

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-06-20 09:19

Date reviewed: 2013-06-21 16:40

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I am not clear why the authors did not randomise the patients & stratify them for age/comorbidity etc - not doing this weakens the data considerably I am not clear why high risk patients & those with a previous colonic procedures were excluded thereby reducing the applicability of the results to the general population.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4175

Title: POST-ANAESTHETIC DISCHARGE SCORING SYSTEM FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF PATIENT RECOVERY AND DISCHARGE AFTER COLONOSCOPY PERFORMED UNDER SEDATION. A PROSPECTIVE STUDY

Reviewer code: 00070280

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-06-20 09:19

Date reviewed: 2013-06-23 19:56

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting study. Which has important clinical application. However, it will be important to include a cost analysis on what faster discharge time means.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4175

Title: POST-ANAESTHETIC DISCHARGE SCORING SYSTEM FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF PATIENT RECOVERY AND DISCHARGE AFTER COLONOSCOPY PERFORMED UNDER SEDATION. A PROSPECTIVE STUDY

Reviewer code: 00069398

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-06-20 09:19

Date reviewed: 2013-06-29 14:04

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I enjoy reading this manuscript. I have two questions for the authors: 1. The control group in this study are being assessed by the endoscopists and discharged according to the patients' vitals parameters. What is the defined time interval between the first assessment and the end of the colonoscopy, and what is the time interval when some of these patients need to be re-assessed? If there's no well defined time interval for assessment, then it's unfair to make comparison between the two groups. For example, some endoscopists like to assess their patients at time of change of cases but some may elect to review a few cases together near the end of the endoscopy session. 2. In table 1, I don't understand why patients presenting with "severe" surgical bleeding are given 2 points in the PADSS score.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4175

Title: POST-ANAESTHETIC DISCHARGE SCORING SYSTEM FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF PATIENT RECOVERY AND DISCHARGE AFTER COLONOSCOPY PERFORMED UNDER SEDATION. A PROSPECTIVE STUDY

Reviewer code: 00070632

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-06-20 09:19

Date reviewed: 2013-07-14 04:00

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

There are a lot of published in the literatures. This study has not different contribution to literature. For that reason this study is not worth to published at your journal. King regards. Ozgur KEMIK, MD. Assoc. Prof of Surgery