

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 33153

Title: Endoscopic recommendations for colorectal cancer screening and surveillance in patients with inflammatory bowel disease: Review of general recommendations

Reviewer's code: 03658316

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-02-08 16:33

Date reviewed: 2017-02-12 22:44

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

Interesting review. I suggest some changes: 1. Pag 7, line 16: add “)” after inflammation; 2. Pag 10, line 29: “the terms terms”--> “the terms”. 3. I suggest to add a paragraph on endoscopic surveillance after surgery. 4. I suggest to add a table that summarizes high, intermediate and low grade risk factors and relative timing of endoscopic surveillance recommended by various scientific societies

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 33153

Title: Endoscopic recommendations for colorectal cancer screening and surveillance in patients with inflammatory bowel disease: Review of general recommendations

Reviewer's code: 03254146

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-02-08 16:33

Date reviewed: 2017-02-19 23:32

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 checked="" 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

The authors reviewed the guidelines and consensuses from around the world on the recommendation of screening for colorectal cancer in patients with Inflammatory Bowel Disease, extracted some general rules and made some their original recommendations. Major points: Please describe the way to make their original recommendations in detail including the following points. 1) How to select scientific societies. Why are there three societies from UK. Ex) inclusion and exclusion criteria. 2) Please provide the strength of each societies recommendations. Ex) strong or weak recommendation and agreement rate. For readers to overview the societies' recommendation, please provide some tables. 3) Each guideline was published in different year. Please introduce any significant paper which influence guidelines' differences if there are. 4) Please provide the authors' decision criteria to make their original recommendations. Ex) When and what do they recommend (How many societies' recommendation are needed? Strength of recommendation affected their original recommendations?) ? How many authors in their seven co-authors agreed with their own recommendations? Minor points 1) Please include core recommendations in core tip (some simple

general recommendations) and abstract (some general recommendations) for the readers to catch them easily if possible within the word count's limitation. 2) Page 2, 3 line from the bottom. Please include the related references on CRC in IBD and CRC-related mortality. 3) Page3, line 5. Please include the reason why Japanese physician started screening earlier than the recommended timing. 4) Page4, line12. On PSC, endoscopy refers to ERCP for the diagnosis? 5) Page 4, line20. Please explain why NASPGHAN changed their recommended timing. 6) Page 5, line 1. Please indicate "endoscopy" in detail in PSC, what kind of endoscopy. 7) Page 7, line 13. ")" is needed. 8) Page 9, 4 lines from the bottom. The lowest concentration of indigo carmine is 0.003% or 0.03% ? 9) Page 10, line 9 lines from the bottom. There are two "terms". 10) Although the authors don't recommend to use the terms "dysplasia-associated lesion or mass (DALM)" and "flat lesions". On the other hand they described "However, there are still consensus that continue to use the terms "sporadic adenomas" and "DALM"s[4,6,9,15,18]. The readers might be confused with these opposite descriptions.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 33153

Title: Endoscopic recommendations for colorectal cancer screening and surveillance in patients with inflammatory bowel disease: Review of general recommendations

Reviewer's code: 03476711

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-02-08 16:33

Date reviewed: 2017-02-24 16:55

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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

Dear authors Thank you for your work. There are few comments in the submitted letter.