



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 47861

Title: Endoscopic advances in the management of non-variceal upper gastrointestinal bleeding: A review

Reviewer’s code: 02445726

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FEBG, N/ A, PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer’s country: United Kingdom

Author’s country: United States

Reviewer chosen by: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-06-03 06:09

Reviewer performed review: 2019-06-18 23:58

Review time: 15 Days and 17 Hours

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 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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

The article is well written. The authors are definitely familiar with the problem of the upper GI bleed. However, I am astonished at they have not written the article ending. Other minor suggestions: 1. to remove in the first sentence of the abstract word “proximal”. 2. In the introduction, I would finish the sentence “Upper gastrointestinal bleeding (UGIB) is defined as any gastrointestinal bleeding that originates above the ligament of Treitz, which includes the esophagus, stomach, and proximal duodenum” after the words “... above the ligament Treitz”. The word “proximal” is not the most appropriate word in the definition because it does not determinate well the border. 3. The American Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy guidelines stated that no single modality has been shown to be superior for treating upper gastrointestinal bleeding caused by peptic ulcer disease. The authors touched very important issue – the described by them clips can be used alone. It would be great if they would like to have a look at the problem of one or more method should be applied during one endoscopic procedure. Moreover, I think it's prudent to write not only little about different types of clips.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

[Y] No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 47861

Title: Endoscopic advances in the management of non-variceal upper gastrointestinal bleeding: A review

Reviewer’s code: 02954830

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer’s country: Viet Nam

Author’s country: United States

Reviewer chosen by: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-06-28 21:41

Reviewer performed review: 2019-06-29 10:43

Review time: 13 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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

The manuscript "Therapeutic Advances in the Management of Non-variceal Upper Gastrointestinal Bleeding: A Review" provides an up-to-date review. I have the following comments 1. Title: the authors mainly discuss about the advances of endoscopic therapy. Therefore, the title should be change accordingly. 2. Introduction: as above mentioned, the part should be re-write to be more concise regarding endoscopic treatment. 3. The structures of difference parts of the manuscript should be similar. Some parts were discussed in details including history of the technique development while other were short 4. A table which summarizes the types of emerging therapies should be added at the beginning of the body. 5. A tabel which summarizes the types of aimed lesions for each emerging therapies and the available evidence to support should make the review more comprehensive. 6. Conclusion: the authors should add a conclusion section in this manuscript.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No