BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy
ESPS manuscript NO: 13783
Title: Accuracy of endoscopists' estimate of polyp size: A continuous dilemma
Reviewer's code: 02907727
Reviewer's country: Australia
Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong
Date sent for review: 2014-09-01 18:59
Date reviewed: 2014-11-18 05:59

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[Y] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[Y] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. The authors may wish to address the following comments. Title: The title should better reflect the content of the manuscript rather than referring to a proposed solution that was not addressed in this study. Abstract: Acceptable Introduction: Please correct the third last and final sentences. Materials and Methods: 1. Given the size of the department and the duration of the study, why were there so few patients? The inclusion and exclusion criteria must be explained in detail. 2. How were the visual estimates of polyp size performed? Was there comparison to the closed biopsy forceps for example? 3. How was the pathologist estimation of size performed? On the macroscopic measurement at the cut-up bench? On the glass slide? 4. What influenced the decision to use the different methods of polypectomy? Results: 1. If you are including demographic data and method of polypectomy in the results then this needs to be explained in the materials and methods. For example: Demographic data was collected from... The method of polypectomy (include potential methods) was recorded for all cases.... 2. It may be useful to know which measurement was used to inform the surveillance guidelines. Most gastroenterologists use their own measurement. Is this the case at your institution? If so, how often

would using the pathological size have changed the surveillance interval? 3. There is a significant difference in accuracy of polyp size estimate depending on the method of polypectomy. Expanding on the above comments, is this related to a difference in method of visual estimation of polyp size when a snare is employed versus biopsy forceps (where the closed forceps provide some reference to size)? 4. The final paragraph of the results is missing data. 5. This is not obligatory, but it would be interesting to have breakdown of the polyps by pathological type (i.e. conventional adenomas versus serrated polyps). Expanding on this it would be interesting to know if there was more discrepancy in size estimation for serrated polyps than conventional adenomas. Discussion The discussion is clear and concise

BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy
ESPS manuscript NO: 13783
Title: Accuracy of endoscopists' estimate of polyp size: A continuous dilemma
Reviewer's code: 02941693
Reviewer's country: United States
Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong
Date sent for review: 2014-09-01 18:59
Date reviewed: 2014-11-11 00:07

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well-written manuscript. The retrospective nature of the study may actually be a plus as it gives a true representation of the endoscopists estimation of size as they would normally do in their routine practice. It is interesting that the literature is split on this topic, as some previous papers describe endoscopists underestimating the size of polyps. The novelty of this paper is fairly low but it does provide more evidence that a more standardized method of polyp measurement is needed. Pg 9- line 2 there is a typo as there is no number before the "cm by pathologist".