

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 34836

Title: Clinical outcomes of Clutch Cutter endoscopic submucosal dissection for older patients with early gastric cancer

Reviewer's code: 02445477

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-06-12

Date reviewed: 2017-06-12

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 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 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

I read your manuscript with interest. Only suggestion is 80 is more uncommon age to include

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 34836

Title: Clinical outcomes of Clutch Cutter endoscopic submucosal dissection for older patients with early gastric cancer

Reviewer's code: 00505466

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-06-12

Date reviewed: 2017-07-01

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 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 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 checked="" 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

The authors present an interesting study on the efficacy and safety of endoscopic submucosal dissection for older patients with early gastric cancer. The study is well designed, the results are accurately noted and the discussion is concise. Some comments are to be made. I would suggest adding "with Early Gastric Cancer" to the Title "Clinical Outcomes of Clutch Cutter Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection for Older Patients". Similarly, I would suggest adding this to the short title. In the Abstract, the acronym ESDCC should be explained. The numbers of patients in each group are noted twice, once in the Methods and once in the Results. I would suggest deleting those numbers in the Methods paragraph. Although mentioned in the Methods, the results regarding change in performance status are not noted in the abstract. Please note the results or otherwise delete in Methods the fact that change in performance status was studied. In the Introduction, is stated "Endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD) has become widely accepted ...". Please add for what it is widely accepted. In the Abstract is noted that it is



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

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

a retrospective study. This should also be noted in the Methods. How were the data gathered? From files or from a (prospective) database? The authors examined the change in performance status. How was this found in a retrospective study, with most probably absence of performance status in a large number of files? Please clarify these issues. Figure 5. Please explain the acronym ESDCC