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Reviewer's report:

The usefulness of different maneuvers during the insertion phase of colonoscopy (patient repositioning, endoscop stiffening, external abdominal pressure) have been described as helpful to intubate the ceacum and are widely used. However, evidence for their effect are largely lacking. Therefore, the study by Heigh and c-workers therefore deals with an important topic.

However, unfortunately, in my opinion, he study fails to address the abovementioned issues properly and I would therefore recommend to reject the paper.

Flaws:

1. the study lacks a clear statement of the study aim and an explanation of the methods used to accomplish this aim. While a definiton of the study aim is completely lacking in the introduction, the abstract states that the authors would aim to "better understand how these maneuvers affect coecal intubation". However, the study does not give any answers to that question. To address this, the invetigators would have chosen a different design, allowing the reader to distinguish between insertion with and without the attempted maneuvers and their effect. A back-to-back design would have been the better approach.

2. Only about 1 patient per day has been included in the trial during the study period. This questions the validity of the results as a selection bias must be considered.

3. The choice of both the endoscopse used and the maneuvers applied are not clear to the reader and may affect the outcome of the study.

3. the authors fail to acknowledge a number of papers that already exist on the topic (e.g. Shah et al GIE 2002, Hoff et al Scand J Gastro 2007).

4. It is unclear how a success/non-success of the different maneuvers are defined.

5. The use of the stiffening function is not explained (grade of stiffening)

6. statistics are lacking completely

7. the conclusion of the trial does not fit to the aim at all. Moreover, the trial cannot tell anything about the usefulness of the Em endoscope with regard to visualisation of the endoscope in reality (however, other studies have looked at that in the past).
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