

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 50361

Title: Treatment of Early Stage (T1) Esophageal Adenocarcinoma: Personalizing the best therapy choice

Reviewer's code: 00001114

Position: Editor-in-Chief

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor

Reviewer's country: Japan

Author's country: United States

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Zhou Tang

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-08-26 10:41

Reviewer performed review: 2019-08-30 07:14

Review time: 3 Days and 20 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

Thank you for allowing me to review the manuscript: "Treatment of Early Stage (T1) Esophageal Adenocarcinoma: Personalizing the best therapy choice ". I think this review is well written about this topic. I have some comments – 1. There did not seem to be an abstract in this manuscript. 2. In INTRODUCTION, in the first sentence, please provide more updated epidemiological data from the web page of "International Agency for Research on Cancer". 3. Please provide more tables of summary of "ENDOSCOPIC THERAPIES" because they are reader-friendly for much information. 4. As well known, endoscopic resection includes both endoscopic mucosal resection (EMR) and endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD). ESD can get larger specimens than EMR, allowing more precise histological evaluation and higher en-bloc resection rates, and potentially reducing the incidence of recurrence. I would like to recommend the authors describe the detail of ER methods for superficial esophageal adenocarcinoma. 5. In EMERGENT TREATMENT STRATEGIES, Chemoradiotherapy and Endoscopic Resection, I feel a confusing sentences in the 2nd paragraph, "Existing research regarding CRT+ER ~ that of surgery (Ref#88)" because Ref# 88 by Minashi et al examined patients with T1b (SM1-2) SCC, but this sentence did not explain SCC patients.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title



**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>

[] Duplicate publication

[] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 50361

Title: Treatment of Early Stage (T1) Esophageal Adenocarcinoma: Personalizing the best therapy choice

Reviewer's code: 03251421

Position: Editor-in-Chief

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's country: China

Author's country: United States

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Zhou Tang

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-08-26 13:57

Reviewer performed review: 2019-08-31 14:32

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 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 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



**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

This manuscript reviewed the current knowledge about treatment of early Stage (T1) esophageal adenocarcinoma. It is an interesting area and requires further research. This review, however, failed to provide novel insight into this subject.

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 Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 50361

Title: Treatment of Early Stage (T1) Esophageal Adenocarcinoma: Personalizing the best therapy choice

Reviewer's code: 00069471

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's country: Japan

Author's country: United States

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Zhou Tang

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-08-26 12:51

Reviewer performed review: 2019-09-03 07:21

Review time: 7 Days and 18 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 checked="" 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 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

In this review article, authors dealt with treatment options for T1 EAC. Generally speaking, this is well-written and organized. Major comments: 1. As for endoscopic resection, both endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD) and endoscopic mucosal resection (EMR) should be mentioned. Is there any advantage of ESD compared to EMR? 2. As for minimally invasive esophagectomy (MIE), some more detailed content is advisable, such as methods. 3. As for biomarkers and precision medicine section, it seems more appropriate that some tables are used.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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