

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 43184

Title: Endoscopic resection for residual lesion of metastatic gastric cancer: a case report

Reviewer's code: 03727107

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-10-29

Date reviewed: 2018-10-31

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reported that a case in a patient with metastatic gastric cancer that responded the chemotherapy and had a complete resection of the residual tumor using ESD. This is an interesting case. I have some comments. (1) Why did the patient came to the institution for treatment after four months from initial diagnosis? Why did it take



**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

so long? (2) This sentence should be corrected. -> "The tumor grew (Figure 1A,B) and abdominal CT showed..." - Figure 1B is a histologic finding. You'd be better to show the initial picture and the later picture (after four months). (3) How did you identify that a residual tumor was suspected under the mucosal layer? Did you perform the EUS? Please comment this.

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 Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 43184

Title: Endoscopic resection for residual lesion of metastatic gastric cancer: a case report

Reviewer's code: 02551224

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-11-19

Date reviewed: 2018-11-19

Review time: 11 Hours

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input 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 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

Dear Authors, the manuscript entitled "Endoscopic resection for residual lesion of metastatic gastric cancer: a case report", By Hayashi K et al from Japan, is an interesting case report regarding an elderly patient having an almost complete response to chemotherapy for metastatic gastric carcinoma, presenting a minimal residual disease at



**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

the gastric cardia, successfully resected by endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD). It is a very fortunate case showing that chemotherapy can be very successful even in advanced gastric cancer. It shows also that ESD can be safely and effectively used also in elderly patients with minimal residual disease at the primary site. I think the article is well documented and deserves publication, but I recommend a thorough language revision, since the English language is really poor.

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 Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 43184

Title: Endoscopic resection for residual lesion of metastatic gastric cancer: a case report

Reviewer's code: 02444931

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-11-19

Date reviewed: 2018-11-25

Review time: 6 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 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 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

1.The topic could have been more specific by emphasizing the endoscopic submucosal dissection. 2.The case report is not detailed enough. The examination results of the patient during the visit are described, while there is no description of the improvement in patient symptoms. In addition, most of them are subjective descriptions, lacking



**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

objective data such as the size of tumors in the stomach and liver. 3.The discussion is not deep enough. The innovation of this case lies in the local control by ESD, but it has not been fully discussed. For example, what treatments have been chosen for other cases under the same conditions? How is the effect and what is the prognosis compared to the ESD? We need to learn more about advantages of ESD and how to select the appropriate treatment.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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