



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 88799

Title: Adverse events associated with the Gold Probe and the Injection Gold Probe devices used for endoscopic hemostasis: A MAUDE database analysis.

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 05051947

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: China

Author’s Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-10-09 23:32

Reviewer performed review: 2023-10-17 07:57

Review time: 7 Days and 8 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This search elicited 140 reports for Gold Probe and 202 reports for Injection Gold Probe during the study period from January 2013 to August 2023. The results showed that malfunctions reportedly occurred in 130 cases for GP, and actual patient injury or event occurred in 10 patients. 149 patients (74%) reported with Injection Gold Probe events suffered no significant consequences due to the device failure, but 53 patients (26%) were affected by an event. This study of the FDA MAUDE database revealed the type, number, and trends of reported device-related adverse events. The endoscopist and support staff must be aware of these device-related events and be equipped to manage them if they occur. I think the work is interesting and can be accepted for publication in the journal. As a reader, I also want to find some proceedings summary on the recent progress of endoscopic hemostasis (like hydrogel, power, etc: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2023.125754>), which should be emphasized during the revision.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 88799

Title: Adverse events associated with the Gold Probe and the Injection Gold Probe devices used for endoscopic hemostasis: A MAUDE database analysis.

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 02904354

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Academic Editor, Associate Chief Physician, Associate Professor, Deputy Director

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: China

Author’s Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-09

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-01 10:39

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-13 13:32

Review time: 12 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty



Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Generally, this study is a bit superficial and descriptive. Some specific comments are listed. 1. The beginning of a sentence should not start with an Arabic numeral. For example, the authors said “149 patients (74%) reported with ...” in the 19th line of page 3. 2. In the 8th line of page 5, “(UGIB” should be revised as “(UGIB)”. 3. In the 7th line of page 6, check formatting errors. 4. In the 17th line of page 6, the authors mentioned querying the database from January 2013 to August 2023, but previously mentioned querying the database from June 2013 to August 2023. 5. In the 11th line of page 7, the full name of “ERCP” was not written when it first appeared. 6. In the Table 1a and 1b, the full names of “EGD” and “ERCP” were not written when they first appeared. 7. The discussion on IGP reports exceeding GP reports is not enough, and the reasons should be discussed and analyzed. 8. Discuss and analyze why the number of GP and IGP devices reports has decreased after 2017. Discuss and analyze the connection between



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

device issues and patient complications in the event.