



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 40799

**Title:** Role of Endoscopic therapy in Early Esophageal Cancer

**Reviewer's code:** 02440966

**Reviewer's country:** South Korea

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2018-07-10

**Date reviewed:** 2018-07-14

**Review time:** 4 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is a good editorial about endoscopic treatment of early esophageal cancer. The authors summarized the ER results according to the histologic subtype. For better understading of readers for ER technique, please insert the Table showing the merits and defaults of each ER tecnique if possible.



**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**

#### 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:** 40799

**Title:** Role of Endoscopic therapy in Early Esophageal Cancer

**Reviewer’s code:** 03666472

**Reviewer’s country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2018-07-10

**Date reviewed:** 2018-07-15

**Review time:** 5 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Dear authors, As a whole, this paper is well reviewed, but some sentences should be modified. 1) Authors described “Larger tumors with diameter greater than 2.5 cm achieved greater curative resection rates as compared to the smaller tumors. On the other hand, the reference [46] described that “The pooled R0 resection rate was 85% (95%



**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

CI, 80%-90%) for large tumor and 92% (95% CI, 87%-93%) for small tumor ( $p < 0.001$ ).  
“Greater” is apparently incorrect. Lower or slightly lower seems to be appropriate. 2)

Authors described “Ishihara et al in their retrospective study on 136 patients in Japan, showed that in lesions smaller than 15 mm, ESD was associated with achieving complete remission. [49] I don’t think this sentence is appropriate, because this [ 49] abstract described that “The en bloc resection rates decreased in the order of ESD (100%), EMR using a transparent cap (EMRC) (87%), and 2-channel EMR (71%). However, the differences showed only marginal significance. The curative resection rate of ESD (97%) was significantly higher than those of the other 2 methods. Furthermore, the curative resection rate of EMRC (71%) was significantly higher than that of 2-channel EMR (46%). In lesions <15 mm, the en bloc and curative resection rates were significantly higher for EMRC (100% and 86%, respectively) than 2-channel EMR (86% and 51%, respectively), whereas no significant differences were found between the en bloc and curative resection rates of EMRC and ESD.” In general, en bloc resection rate and curative resection rate of EMR or EMRC are largely influenced by the size of lesions, but those of ESD are much less influenced. Authors also described that “Overall, ESD has led to excellent 5-year survival rates of 90% to 99% in Asian countries.[47,48]” I think it is better to add “excellent en bloc resection rates and curative resection rates” to this sentence or change your sentence appropriately. 3) Authors described that “In patients undergoing ESD for ESCC, the rates of strictures may be higher if the entire circumferential esophagus is dissected and >5 cm of longitudinal muscle defect length is present. [54]” This sentence includes an incorrect word. “muscle defect” should be changed to “mucosal defect”. 4) Authors repeated this sentence in another paragraph as follows, “In patients undergoing ESD or EMR for ESCC, the rates of stricture/stenosis may be higher with ESD if the entire circumferential esophagus is dissected and >5 cm of longitudinal muscle defect length is present. [54]” This sentence should be deleted to



**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**

avoid the repetition. 5) Authors described “EMR is generally a safe procedure with rare risk of complications. With focal EMR, strictures and bleeding are seen in about 2% respectively. [36] SRER or extensive EMR can cause bleeding in 2.4% to 25% cases. [24] The rate of stricture formation is also higher as compared to focal EMR, with rates as high as 33-88% as shown in some studies. [24,37] Perforations are rare with EMR and seen in 0-5% of patients. [38]” I am afraid that “rare” seems to be underestimated. It seems to be better that “rare” is changed to “low” or an another word.

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

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

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

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

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No