



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 58333

**Title:** Analysis of 234 cases of colorectal polyps treated by endoscopic mucosal resection

**Reviewer's code:** 02856139

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** FEBG, MAMS, MBBS, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor, Research Scientist, Senior Lecturer

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Germany

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-07-19

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-08-11 01:33

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-08-17 23:57

**Review time:** 6 Days and 22 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](https://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Endoscopic mucosal resection (EMR) is an established technique for treating large colonic polyps. The manuscript reported pathology characteristics and analyzed risk factors for the incidence of the disease, unsuccessful operation and postoperative complications in patients with colorectal polyps undergoing endoscopic mucosal resection. The trial was well thought-out and adequately carried out with equipment and protocols described in detail. Comments were as following: 1. Polyps resected in the study were categorized into different Yamada types. Could it be possible for the author to cite references to explain the basis for this classification? 2. It's better to put demographic information in the general information section rather than in the result section. 3. Some expressions in the manuscript should be polished. For example, the British English word "analyse" should be changed into American English word "analyze". The expression of "block the path of colorectal cancer" did not express clearly the meaning the author intended to say.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 58333

**Title:** Analysis of 234 cases of colorectal polyps treated by endoscopic mucosal resection

**Reviewer's code:** 02856936

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** FCPS, FRCPA, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Professor, Research Associate, Senior Scientist

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-07-19

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-08-11 01:33

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-08-18 00:05

**Review time:** 6 Days and 22 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](https://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

In this study, the endoscopic morphologic features, pathologic types and clinical situation, evaluate the efficacy and safety of EMR were investigated. The design of the study is good, and the sample size is large. The results are interesting, and well discussed. The manuscript is overall well written, and a minor editing is required.