

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 55422

Title: Endoscopic full-thickness resection using an over-the-scope device: A prospective study

Reviewer's code: 00044980

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-11-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-11-18 15:23

Reviewer performed review: 2020-11-27 15:27

Review time: 9 Days

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript is a prospective study of endoscopic full-thickness resection using an over-the-scope device. There are several novelties in this manuscript. However, I have some comments as follows, Major 1. Abstract: The abstract is too long, please shorten it. 2. The indication for EFTR using OTSC is SMT originating from muscularis propria less than 2cm in diameter. Why was the size less than 2cm in diameter? I think that it is not necessary to resect small SMT such as benign tumor. How is the indication for this procedure decided? Are change of tumor size and/or shape or histological findings considered? 3. Were those tumors made a pathological diagnosis before EFTR? 4. The indication for EFTR using OTSC includes gastric cancers and colonic cancers. However, ESD has recently become as standard therapy. If ESD is difficult to resect the lesions, not only lesions but also lymph node should be resected for complete curability. 5. EFTR procedure time for some lesion was too long (236min). Why did it take more time? 6. Was follow up endoscopy performed after EFTR? Were resected sites in some lesions open after EFTR? 7. What is the criteria of mild adverse events? 8. Was bleeding, fever, or local peritonitis included into moderate adverse events? 9. Authors mention in Discussion section EMR or ESD are associated with a low rate of R0-resection and high perforation rate. However, ESD recently shows high rate of R0-resection and low perforation rate. Minor 1. Abstract: Please change “52±10.54” to “52±10.5”. please change “12.56±4.26” to “12.6±4.3”. 2. Please unify the form of references.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 55422

Title: Endoscopic full-thickness resection using an over-the-scope device: A prospective study

Reviewer's code: 00044980

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-11-17

Reviewer chosen by: Chen-Chen Gao

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-15 16:07

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-12 01:32

Review time: 27 Days and 9 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I think that major revision is necessary for this manuscript. Authors revised the manuscript, however, it has not been fully revised yet. Please mention the responses to reviewer's comments No. 2, 5 in Discussion section. Authors did not unify the form of references at all. For example, in No 5, please correct "2018 Jun;32(6):" to "2018;32:".