



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 38438

**Title:** Comparing Outcomes for Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection between Eastern and Western Countries: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 03474116

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2018-03-11

**Date reviewed:** 2018-03-13

**Review time:** 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

General: In this study, authors compared efficacy of ESD between Eastern and Western countries. Meta-analyses showed higher rates of curative, en bloc, and R0 resection in the Eastern studies compared to Western Studies. The percentage of perforation

requiring surgery was significantly greater in the Western countries. Authors concluded that Eastern countries show better ESD outcomes compared to Western countries. Although this study was well written, there were any problems in this study, as below. Major comments: 1. Authors compared efficacy of ESD including esophageal, gastric and colon cancers between Eastern and Western countries by meta-analysis. In general, requirement of ESD differ among esophageal, gastric and colon cancers. Therefore, authors should divide efficacy into three different organs (esophageal, gastric and colon cancers). 2. Authors included prospective and retrospective study. Authors should divide efficacy into prospective and retrospective study. 3. How about differences of ESD-related parameters among different Eastern countries? 4. How about association with bleeding and use of anti-thrombotic drugs? 5. Please delete Figures S3-S9. 6. Please add P values in Table 1.

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

### *Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

### *BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 38438

**Title:** Comparing Outcomes for Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection between Eastern and Western Countries: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 02446765

**Reviewer's country:** South Korea

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2018-03-11

**Date reviewed:** 2018-03-19

**Review time:** 7 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting study on comparing the outcomes of ESD between Eastern and Western countries. Major concerns; 1. The authors compared various outcomes of ESD between Eastern and Western countries. However, outcomes are quite variable

according to the organ even in the same center. I would recommend the authors to analyze the data more according to the organ. 2. Lots of RCTs were performed in Eastern countries but not in Western countries. Volume of the studies performed in Eastern countries are enormous. So the level of evidence might be quite different between the two groups. How did the authors try to reduce this bias between the two groups? 3. Considering the learning curve, complication rates might be higher in low volume center. Self-learning, duration of observation for experts' procedures, etc might affect the complication rates. Did the authors consider all of these circumstances?

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 38438

**Title:** Comparing Outcomes for Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection between Eastern and Western Countries: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 00001114

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2018-03-11

**Date reviewed:** 2018-03-20

**Review time:** 9 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments to the Author: This review entitles "Comparing Outcomes for Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection between Eastern and Western Countries: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis" is well-written and comprehensive review about this subject. I have



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

following comments – 1. I feel it is difficult to conclude that EMR would be an adequate alternative to ESD from this analysis in the present study. Therefore, I delete the sentences about EMR in Discussion. Minor comments 1. The authors should replace “ , ” with “ . ” with regard to decimal point in the main text and table. 2. Please revise the number of lesion diameter in Table 1 from 25.65 to 25.7 in Total as well as in Eastern countries and Western countries, respectively, like descriptions in Result section in the main text.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No