

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34207

Title: Systematic review of syndrome of giant gastric lipomas reported since 1980 and report of two new illustrative cases presenting with severe UGI bleeding in a review of 117,110 EGDs

Reviewer's code: 00504545

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-04-12

Date reviewed: 2017-04-12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very important review paper of the main characteristics of the giant gastric lipomas studied in one Hospital through 10 years of study and follow-up. The diagnosis is very well established and also the treatment and prognosis. I find a very complete paper that not need to introduce any changes

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34207

Title: Systematic review of syndrome of giant gastric lipomas reported since 1980 and report of two new illustrative cases presenting with severe UGI bleeding in a review of 117,110 EGDs

Reviewer's code: 00111771

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-04-12

Date reviewed: 2017-04-12

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 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

The article is about an interesting topic and is well written. I believe the English language should be improved before publication