



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 37393

**Title:** Sessile serrated adenoma detection rate is correlated with adenoma detection rate

**Reviewer's code:** 00068472

**Reviewer's country:** Hungary

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2017-12-21

**Date reviewed:** 2017-12-30

**Review time:** 9 Days

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**

General •Although not very original in design, the impact of sessile serrated ADR (SSADR) is very important. •In this retrospective study Daisuke Ohki et al. investigated the association between adenoma detection rate (ADR) and sessile serrated ADR (SSADR) and significant predictors for SSA detection. A total of 3691 colonoscopies were assessed. Overall, 978 (26.5%) low- and 84 (2.2%) high-grade adenomas, 81 (2.2%) cancers, 66 (1.8%) SSAs, and 2 (0.1%) SSAs with cytological dysplasia were detected. Not surprisingly, the Authors demonstrated that ADR correlated to SSADR. In addition, patients with adenomas had a higher prevalence of SSAs than those without adenomas.

Specific comments •Overall, the presentation of the topic is a little confused. •The English language should be slightly improved. •In the Abstract section the Authors should clearly state that it was a retrospective study. •The Authors should spend time to explain the relatively low rate of high-grade dysplasia (HGD) (2.2%) and SSAs (1.8%).



**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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

•How many pathologists were involved in the study? •They should briefly discuss why the mean withdrawal time  $\geq 8$  minutes was not associated with a better ADR and SSA detection. •The Authors should spend time to discuss in more detail the major limitations of the study (first of all retrospective study, single centre, relative small sample size). As mentioned by the authors, the high rate of surveillance colonoscopy is a clear confusing factor, therefore it would be interesting to re-calculate the results without surveillance colonoscopy, taking in consideration just patients with initial screening colonoscopy. •Further prospective, multi-center studies, with larger sample size are needed to establish the clear-cut clinical impact of these presented results.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 37393

**Title:** Sessile serrated adenoma detection rate is correlated with adenoma detection rate

**Reviewer’s code:** 00188995

**Reviewer’s country:** India

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2017-12-31

**Date reviewed:** 2018-01-01

**Review time:** 1 Day

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"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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 study addresses a relevant topic and the paper is well written. However, there are concerns about the methodology of this paper. This is a retrospective study and has the limitations associated with them such as uniformity of observation and data collection and missing data. For example, they have assumed polyps with missing histology or unresected polyp as being non-neoplastic which may not be appropriate. The study participants are heterogeneous and 35.1% patients had ‘others’ as indication for colonoscopy. As colonoscopy is a commonly performed procedure (the data in this study was collected over just 1 year) , this study can be done prospectively with standard protocol and uniform data collection in a homogeneous group of patients.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 37393

**Title:** Sessile serrated adenoma detection rate is correlated with adenoma detection rate

**Reviewer's code:** 00070280

**Reviewer's country:** Sri Lanka

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2017-12-31

**Date reviewed:** 2018-01-03

**Review time:** 3 Days

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**

This is an interesting article on a important topic. However, few points need to be clarified. In the authors classification did they come across traditional serrated adenomas TSA ? What about hyperplastic polyps were they ignored on size alone? Was the NICE classification used by the endoscopist? The low SSA detection rate could be due to decreased awareness of the entity and if they compare with a more recent cohort the rate may be higher. Suggestions Authors should elaborate on the "other indications for colonoscopy in a table as the numbers are large. pictures both of the histological classification and endoscopic appearance should be included



**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

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 37393

**Title:** Sessile serrated adenoma detection rate is correlated with adenoma detection rate

**Reviewer's code:** 00227388

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2017-12-31

**Date reviewed:** 2018-01-06

**Review time:** 6 Days

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

as above



**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

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 37393

**Title:** Sessile serrated adenoma detection rate is correlated with adenoma detection rate

**Reviewer's code:** 00504462

**Reviewer's country:** Mexico

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2017-12-31

**Date reviewed:** 2018-01-08

**Review time:** 7 Days

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"/> 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

Dear Sir, Thank you for letting me be part of your team. I think that this manuscript can be send to be published after they clarify some points of the description of the serrated polyps. Thank you Sincerely