

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 91475

Title: How to Establish an Endoscopic Bariatric Practice

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05393454

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2023-12-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-01-13 05:07

Reviewer performed review: 2024-01-15 17:58

Review time: 2 Days and 12 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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

1. The English need improvement since there are some grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript. For example, the words “thoughtful” may be as “the thoughtful”; “endobariatric” as “endo bariatric”; “transforms the” as “transform the”; “we therefore” as “we, therefore,”; “metabolically-enriched” as “metabolically enriched”; “with the bariatric” as “with a bariatric”; “into a practice” as “into practice”. The grammar mistakes which are not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly. 2. Check the abbreviations throughout the manuscript and introduce the abbreviation when the full word appears the first time in the abstract (For example, BMI, etc.). Make a word abbreviated in the article that is repeated at least three times in the text, not all words to be abbreviated. 3. The intrudouction part appears less informative about the “endoscopic bariatric therapies”, thus this section should be indicated as detailed to understand the study in clear. 4. The authors should properly mention the subscript and superscript (For example, in “CO₂” “2” should be properly subscript) and it should be checked throughout the manuscript, wherever applicable. 5. The limitation of the

editorial may be given along with conclusion or under separate heading for understanding the concepts clearly.