

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 47540

Title: Endoscopic characteristics of small intestinal malignant tumors observed by balloon-assisted enteroscopy

Reviewer's code: 03668668

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Ruo-Yu Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-25 11:55

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-28 13:45

Review time: 3 Days and 1 Hour

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 checked="" 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 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 Editors, I read with great interest the study by Horie et al entitled "Endoscopic characteristics of small intestinal malignant tumors observed by balloon-assisted enteroscopy". This is a single center retrospective experience of the authors with small



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

bowel lesions they encountered while doing balloon enteroscopies. While this is a comprehensive review of small bowel lesions, I have several issues with this so called "study". The first being, how is this a study? And why are there p values when comparing different groups? This is a single center study and how can you state that it is statistically significant that you found more lesions of one group over the other? That does not make sense to me. The second being, again, the statistical analysis comparing location of these lesions - the same principle applies, this could be just due to the cases you received and would not reflect the overall prevalence of these lesions. The third being, the very low sample size to have any meaningful statistical differences. Nevertheless, I do believe this is a good review and should be presented as such.

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 Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 47540

Title: Endoscopic characteristics of small intestinal malignant tumors observed by balloon-assisted enteroscopy

Reviewer's code: 01430778

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Ruo-Yu Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-25 09:15

Reviewer performed review: 2019-04-06 09:50

Review time: 12 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input 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

1. several errors should be corrected: (1) abstract: results: line 5 : (duodenum and jejunum) line 8-10 : the numbers are different from those in Table2: 26.1% -> 27.3%; p=0.003 -> 0.004; 47.8% -> 54.5%; p=0.018 -> <0.001 (2) core tip: line 6 : Group 1 and

Group 3 line 7-8 : 47.8% -> 54.5%; p=0.018 -> <0.001 (3) results: line 5 : epigastric pain ,
melena line 9 : (duodenum and jejunum) (4) Table 2 : solitary lesion (%) 45.5(10/22) ->
40.9 (9/22) 2. comments: (1) from literature review & clinical experience, most small
bowel GISTs present as bleeding or pain; in your Table1, most of them (5/6) present as
others, what are the symptoms? (2) from your results, “infiltrative ulcerated type” is
unique for Group 1 and not seen in lymphoma group, since this is one of your key
findings, please provide typical picture for this lesion (3) another key point is that, in
lymphoma group, when the intact epithelium was ulcerated or lymphoma cells were
present in the deep mucosa, white villi could not be seen, please provide typical
endoscopic & pathological pictures for this lesion

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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