

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 23283

Title: Low volume polyethylene glycol with ascorbic acid, sodium picosulfate-magnesium citrate, and clear liquid diet alone prior to small bowel capsule endoscopy

Reviewer's code: 00041963

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-11-07 12:17

Date reviewed: 2015-11-15 06:45

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input 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 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"/> 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. "Statistical analysis was performed by Fergal Donnellan (University of British Columbia)." Sentence should replace to acknowledgement section. 2. The authors should declare ethical approve of this study.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 23283

Title: Low volume polyethylene glycol with ascorbic acid, sodium picosulfate-magnesium citrate, and clear liquid diet alone prior to small bowel capsule endoscopy

Reviewer's code: 01047575

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-11-07 12:17

Date reviewed: 2015-11-19 22:49

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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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

In this retrospective study, the authors compared three preparation methods prior to small bowel capsule endoscopy. This is an interesting topic in clinics. But there are some problems which should be noted in the manuscript. However, many problems existed which need revision. 1.The content in the part of introduction are not perfect, which needs completed. 2.Material and Methods 1)Patient preparation: the three bowel preparation regimens should be described more detailed. Whether water is needed in the three groups? How about the amount? 2)"Two experienced reviewers who were blinded to preparation (FD and NC) reviewed all capsules for diagnostic evaluation, and both gastric and small bowel transit time", Whether differences existed between the two reviewers? How to achieve consensus? 3)"These were graded within the proximal, mid and distal small bowel using a four-point scale" How is the four-point scale standard is defined? Is it common criteria? 3.Results. "97 (78.9%) patients had a complete small bowel examination and thus included in the analysis." Why are the other 26 patients excluded, inferior bowel preparation? Please state why they can not



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>

complete the examination. 4. Figure 1 is not formal. The title should be under the figure, and text annotation is necessary.