

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 33184

**Title:** Laparoscopic resection of gastrointestinal stromal tumors: Does laparoscopic surgery provide an adequate oncologic resection?

**Reviewer's code:** 02444931

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-10

**Date reviewed:** 2017-03-19

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

N/A

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 33184

**Title:** Laparoscopic resection of gastrointestinal stromal tumors: Does laparoscopic surgery provide an adequate oncologic resection?

**Reviewer's code:** 02953383

**Reviewer's country:** Taiwan

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-25

**Date reviewed:** 2017-04-05

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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

This review article provides a thorough review of the current literature, focusing on the use of laparoscopic surgery for larger GISTs and the long-term oncologic outcomes and comparing the results to open surgery. Generally speaking, this article is comprehensive and well-written and proved current available evidence for the readers who may need to make decisions in their clinical practice. The reviewer only has a few suggestions as follow: 1.Although the focus is laparoscopic surgery, the authors may add a brief section on the diagnosis and preoperative evaluation of GIST, such as GI endoscopy, endoscopic ultrasound and CT, all of which may help to guide the treatment strategy and choice of surgical modalities. 2.To enhance the readers' interest, the authors may provide a set of typical figures of a large GIST receiving laparoscopic resection, such as CT, histology, gross and microscopic histology. 3.The footnotes of table 1 are a little confusion. It may look better when the footnotes are put separately below the table, not within the table. 4.Page 2, line 5, either "of" or "for" are suitable, but not both. 5.Page



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

10, line 1, the redundant “were” may be deleted. 6. Page 10, paragraph 3, line 4, I believe the authors meant the “range” of mean/median follow-up periods. 7. Page 12, paragraph 2, line 5-6, “...and found that the oncologic resection.”. This sentence seems incomplete. 8. Page 13, conclusion section, line 10, “Despite the current NCCN recommendations regarding laparoscopic resection of GISTs >5cm, many ...”. This sentence is a little confusing, please rephrase it.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 33184

**Title:** Laparoscopic resection of gastrointestinal stromal tumors: Does laparoscopic surgery provide an adequate oncologic resection?

**Reviewer's code:** 02955019

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-25

**Date reviewed:** 2017-04-11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors Thank you for giving me the nice opportunity to read this article. This is interesting to thoroughly review the current literature, looking particularly at the use of laparoscopic surgery for larger GIST and the long-term oncologic outcomes and comparing the results to open surgery, however it should describe the following queries. Review of literature, and Table1; I suggest Table 1; review of case series should reveal the following data, "Patient and demographic data", "Short-term surgical outcomes", "Postoperative courses", details of "Complication". 1. "Patient and demographic data", such as body mass index, tumor location, tumor circumference, tumor growth pattern, GIST guideline indication, risk classification 2. "Short-term surgical outcomes", such as tumor free margin, operative time, blood loss 3. "Postoperative courses", such as post-operative fasting periods, post-operative dietary intake, hospital stay 4. "Complication" in details, such as "local complication", e.g. anastomotic leakage, stenosis, bleeding, as well as "systematic complication", e.g. pneumonia