



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 41135

**Title:** Video capsule endoscope versus Double-balloon enteroscopy in the diagnosis of small bowel bleeding by vascular source: A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer’s code:** 01557574

**Reviewer’s country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Ying Dou

**Date sent for review:** 2018-07-27

**Date reviewed:** 2018-08-06

**Review time:** 10 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Dear Author, I read the article. You should publish this article (Video capsule endoscope versus Double-balloon enteroscopy in the diagnosis of small bowel bleeding by vascular source: A systematic review and meta-analysis). Sincerely yours. Prof. Dr. Vedat Goral



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

Istanbul Medipol University. Istanbul. Turkey

#### INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

##### *Google Search:*

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### *BPG Search:*

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 41135

**Title:** Video capsule endoscope versus Double-balloon enteroscopy in the diagnosis of small bowel bleeding by vascular source: A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer’s code:** 03726743

**Reviewer’s country:** United States

**Science editor:** Ying Dou

**Date sent for review:** 2018-07-27

**Date reviewed:** 2018-08-13

**Review time:** 17 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

In the manuscript entitled, “Double-balloon enteroscopy vs video capsule endoscope in the diagnosis of small bowel bleeding from a vascular source: a systematic review and meta-analysis”, the authors present a study comparing the diagnostic accuracy of



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

capsule endoscopy (VCE) vs. double-balloon enteroscopy (DBE) as well as VCE followed by DBE in cases of obscure gastrointestinal bleeding “of vascular origin”. This is an interesting and multi-disciplinary subject, and the manuscript is generally fairly well written. Perhaps the major concerns here are the results, their interpretation/implications, and methodologic limitations. Additional and more specific comments and suggestions, many of which can be easily resolved and are intended to strengthen the manuscript, are provided below: Title: -“from a vascular source” is superfluous and can be omitted given the title is already quite long and that really all bleeding stems from a vascular source. Abstract: - It would be helpful if the authors could mention what types of studies were included. E.g. only randomized, only prospective, prospective and retrospective, etc. Introduction: -it is unclear why the authors chose to include only double balloon enteroscopy (DBE). -a stronger case needs to be made why a meta-analysis needs to be performed specifically on cases with bleeding from a vascular source. What percentage of bleeding is NOT from a vascular source?? Methods: -See comment in abstract section above. -It should be clarified if the study included both overt as well as occult bleeding or only one or the other. If both were included, they should have separate/stratified analyses, as these may be very different entities. Results: -Overall, the Results section seems suboptimally composed, possibly due to the sequence in which results are presented or because organization is not great. -The following sentence is difficult to understand, likely due to punctuation issues: “The lesions were identified 3150 exams (1722 VCE and 1428 DBE) in 2043 patients and of 2248 sources of bleeding 1467 were found to be vascular lesions.” Also, how could the number of lesions be lower than the number of patients? Perhaps the authors are trying to convey that in some patients, despite documented bleed, the source lesion was not found? -What are DBEF and BDE? -What is a vascular lesion detection index? Discussion: -What is meant by: “Our review shows DBE is reasonably



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

sensitive and has high specificity, however it performs worse VCE performance.” ? -The limitations paragraph is quite brief; would encourage the authors to reflect on and include other limitations. -The real take-home message is unclear. Are the authors suggesting that DBE not be performed as an initial test? I.e. that capsule be performed so as to improve the yield? Or should DBE be performed as an initial test only when the bleeding is overt? Figure and Tables: -No major concerns or critiques. -A suggested management algorithm would be helpful.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 41135

**Title:** Video capsule endoscope versus Double-balloon enteroscopy in the diagnosis of small bowel bleeding by vascular source: A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer’s code:** 03028174

**Reviewer’s country:** Thailand

**Science editor:** Ying Dou

**Date sent for review:** 2018-07-27

**Date reviewed:** 2018-08-14

**Review time:** 18 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The article is aimed to compare the diagnostic accuracy of capsule endoscopy (VCE) and double-balloon enteroscopy (DBE) in cases of obscure gastrointestinal bleeding of vascular origin. The title is “Video capsule endoscope versus Double-balloon



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

enteroscopy in the diagnosis of small bowel bleeding by vascular source: A systematic review and meta-analysis". 1. Several factors influence the outcome of the study. Please discuss these issues. 2. Please add more details of the discussion section. 3. Please also add more details of the limitations of the study. 4. What are the new knowledges from this study? 5. Please recommend the readers "How to apply this knowledge for routine clinical practice?".

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No