PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology
Manuscript NO: 35335
Title: Value of histomorphometric tumour thickness and smoothelin for conventional m-classification in early oesophageal adenocarcinoma
Reviewer's code: 03253691
Reviewer's country: Turkey
Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong
Date sent for review: 2017-07-19
Date reviewed: 2017-07-30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good		[ ] Duplicate publication	
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Minor revision
	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

this is well-conducted and well-written study, and i have no further recommendation.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good		[ ] Duplicate publication	
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[Y] Minor revision
	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments to the Author: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review the manuscript: " Value of histomorphometric tumour thickness and smoothelin for conventional m-classification in early oesophageal adenocarcinoma ". I think this paper is interesting and well written. I have following comments, Comments 1. I was wondering if the authors finally think that the depth of infiltration from the surface to the invasion front can replace with classical pT diagnosis or not. As the authors described that exact pT staging is of crucial importance in early adenocarcinoma of the oesophagus as the risk of lymph node metastasis increases with infiltration depth. I would like to expect the measurement from the surface correlate with lymphatic invasion or vascular invasion based on ESD specimen. 2. In association with #1, if the authors have available clinical long-term outcomes such as details of additional surgical treatment or lymph or distinct metastasis after ESD or additional treatment. I would like

the authors to show them if possible. 3. I was wondering if the tumor thickness of polypoid lesion had relationship with lymphatic invasion or vascular invasion although it may not reflect the pT stage. 4. Please show the definition of polypoid growth pattern that the authors excluded. For example, the length of the polypoid lesion is over 1000μm or more or depending on the endoscopist's report?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology
Manuscript NO: 35335
Title: Value of histomorphometric tumour thickness and smoothelin for conventional m-classification in early oesophageal adenocarcinoma
Reviewer's code: 03252977
Reviewer's country: Croatia
Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong
Date sent for review: 2017-07-19
Date reviewed: 2017-08-01

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[Y] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Dear Authors,   Congratulations on a good job! I find Your work very interesting and applicable in the clinical praxis. I have found only one - grammatical error in the „Results" section. I believe there should be written: „...(m1-m3), showed significantly...", instead of „showing significantly".. Or please rearrange a whole sentence.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology
Manuscript NO: 35335
Title: Value of histomorphometric tumour thickness and smoothelin for conventional m-classification in early oesophageal adenocarcinoma
Reviewer's code: 03003719
Reviewer's country: Belgium
Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong
Date sent for review: 2017-07-19
Date reviewed: 2017-08-02

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Although this should be further investigated, however, it is quite interesting paper