

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 18050

Title: Review on sedation for gastrointestinal tract endoscopy in children by non-anesthesiologists

Reviewer's code: 02547273

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-04-08 17:14

Date reviewed: 2015-04-26 00:10

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Some minor modifications are necessary

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 18050

Title: Review on sedation for gastrointestinal tract endoscopy in children by non-anesthesiologists

Reviewer's code: 00068056

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-04-08 17:14

Date reviewed: 2015-04-16 09:45

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The topic of this article is talking about 'non-anaesthesiologist', 'gastrointestinal endoscopy' and 'children', however, personally, I cannot gain enough and useful information regarding to these aspects from its content, I wondered how the readers could make up some practical ideas for clinical practice. For example, the authors emphasized that data from adult cannot be automatically extrapolated to children; data for children are actually scarce? Prescription of propofol had grey zone between anaesthesiologist and pediatrician, however, inhalation anesthetics must be ordered by anaesthesiologist is within the professionalism, and should have no role in the procedure of sedation executed by non-anaesthesiologist. 2. The authors should re-arrange the sections and paragraphs of the main text and discussion. For example, about propofol, the authors put too much attention to its adverse effect in the main text, the meaningful results of clinical studies, however, actually appeared in the discussion. 3. In page 8, line 8 from the bottom, the sentence '...in their review failure to conduct a procedure due to incomplete sedation in 0-0-4% of cases only, despite being performed in 88.1% by....', the grammar and logic of the description seem to be not correct. 4.



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>

Following the above sentence, 'The recovery time was shorter than in a midazolam/merperidine-based protocol...'. Logically, to compare propofol with midazolam/merperidine, the situation of midazolam/merperidine should come earlier in the context, however, it appeared in the later section. 5. In page 8, I cannot agree that laryngospasm might be defined as minor effect. 6. Page 10, bradycardia misspelled to be bradicardia. 7. Page 12, line 13, properties misspelled to be prppertiesproperties.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 18050

Title: Review on sedation for gastrointestinal tract endoscopy in children by non-anesthesiologists

Reviewer's code: 00035901

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-04-08 17:14

Date reviewed: 2015-04-18 12:19

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The present paper was well organized and well investigated. This paper will give us important information about the anesthesia during endoscopy especially in children. I have no claim in the present form.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 18050

Title: Review on sedation for gastrointestinal tract endoscopy in children by non-anesthesiologists

Reviewer's code: 01799104

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-04-08 17:14

Date reviewed: 2015-04-22 11:13

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is a detail literature review of the sedation for GI endoscopy in children. I think this is a review article and should be shown in your topic. The text is not well constructed and the tables are not easy to read. Major revision is suggested.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 18050

Title: Review on sedation for gastrointestinal tract endoscopy in children by non-anesthesiologists

Reviewer's code: 00041963

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-04-08 17:14

Date reviewed: 2015-04-21 04:21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The title should change to " Sedation for gastrointestinal tract endoscopy in children by non-anaesthesiologists" 2.Key words: pediatrics should change to "padiatric-age" 3. The authors should explain the range of pediatric age (ex.0-18 or 4-17 etc)in the material section. 4.Inhalation anaesthetics section should omit because these drugs can only use by anaesthesiologists. 5.A native speaker should check the grammer of the text.