



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 11484

Title: Use of disposable graduated biopsy forceps improves the accuracy of polyp size measurements during endoscopy

Reviewer code: 01220668

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2014-05-26 13:04

Date reviewed: 2014-05-29 08:29

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript by Jin and Leng titled "Use of disposable graduated biopsy forceps improves the accuracy of polyp size measurements during endoscopy" (ESPS Manuscript NO: 11484) was reviewed. I believe it is novel and potentially helpful to the practicing gastroenterologist. Concerns:

1. There is too much redundancy in the Results section. There is no need to describe the results for the polyps as a single group and again according to the differences seen for polyps of different sizes. As such, sections 3.2 and 3.3 can be omitted.
2. The crux of the story is the ability of the gastroenterologist to estimate polyp size by visualization, compared to measurement with biopsy forceps and calipers. That is completely addressed with section 3.4.
3. The last paragraph of section 3.4 (looking at the ratio of visual estimation and forceps measurement) can be omitted. In essence it is simply another way of expressing the data related to polyp sizes. What can be done instead is a short report that visual estimation tends to "over-estimate" polyp size.
4. Paragraph 1 of section 3.4 should be omitted as it is re-stated verbatim in section 3.5.
5. In the Discussion section the information about "All size estimations were based on the clinicians' experience...." Should first be introduced in the Results section, and then expanded upon in the Discussion section.
6. The last sentence of the first paragraph of the Discussion section "Are there any other..." should be omitted, it added nothing to the manuscript.
7. Paragraph 3 of the Discussion section simply re-iterates the results. There needs to be discussion about the results - what do they imply, how will they change management, etc.
8. Table 1 and Figure 1 should be omitted. They add nothing to the study.
9. Figure 3 should be shown as a bar graph, As an example see below:
10. Figure 4 should be omitted.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 11484

Title: Use of disposable graduated biopsy forceps improves the accuracy of polyp size measurements during endoscopy

Reviewer code: 00180958

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2014-05-26 13:04

Date reviewed: 2014-06-10 22:07

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

For the authors A very interesting paper, an original view of the problem. The methodology is correct. A few comments: 1. A comparison with an open biopsy forceps could have been made 2. How many endoscopists were involved in the study and what was the degree of agreement among them?