



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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15895

Title: Clinical impact of endoscopy position detecting unit (UPD-3) for colonoscopy under non-sedated condition

Reviewer's code: 03002168

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-12-16 09:40

Date reviewed: 2014-12-17 10:52

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | PubMed Search: | <input 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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" 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

Scope Guide is a proprietary technology from Olympus <http://medical.olympusamerica.com/products/endoscope-positioning-system/scopeguide-upd-3>.

The manuscript needs to be revised to address how this technology was provided to the investigators and the ownership of this proprietary technology



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15895

Title: Clinical impact of endoscopy position detecting unit (UPD-3) for colonoscopy under non-sedated condition

Reviewer’s code: 02917331

Reviewer’s country: Japan

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-12-16 09:40

Date reviewed: 2014-12-19 19:27

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | PubMed Search: | <input 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"/> 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

Dear authors, In this paper entitled “Clinical impact of endoscopy position detecting unit (UPD-3) for colonoscopy under non-sedated condition”, the authors attempted to evaluate the clinical impact of UPD-3 on colonoscopy. They showed that patient pain using UPD-3 during endoscope insertion was reduced as compared with conventional endoscopy for the procedures performed by trainees. This article seems to have some novelties and the concept of study is interesting, however, several revisions should be needed as follows. Major Comment 1. This is a retrospective case control study as the authors mentioned in the discussion paragraph. However, in the Methods paragraph, the authors described that all data were appeared to be collected prospectively. The authors should described precise inclusion schema of this study. 2. The number of excluded procedures due to technical difficulties are significant result. These results (4 patients of the conventional group and 2 patients of UPD-3) should be included into “Table 2” with P-value. 3. In the “Results”, the authors described “However, univariate analysis showed that only for the TC group, straight insertion methods and UPD-3 guidance were related to lower VAS pain scores during colonoscope insertion.



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>

After controlling for other covariates in the multivariate model, the same 2 factors were found to significantly affect VAS pain scores during colonoscope insertion (Table 3).” These results were not shown in Table3. And also, the title of Table 3 was mistaken. 4. In Table 3, four factors were included into multivariate analysis. Possible significant factor, such as “Gender” should be included into multivariate analysis to adjust possible bias. Because difference of gender was appeared to affect VAS in the expert group. 5.In the “Results”, the authors described “For the EC group, univariate and multivariate analysis showed that only the insertion method (straight insertion methods) was related to lower VAS pain scores during colonoscope insertion (Table 4).” The result of multivariate analysis was not shown in Table4. 6. In “Discussion”, the authors described as “As an initial approach, it may be possible to reduce the pain involved in colonoscope insertion by providing trainees with the opportunity to master the straight insertion technique combined with a UPD-3.” The authors did not elucidate these points. Minor Comment 1. In page 11 on line 5, “Table 4” is miss-typed. (Table 3?)