



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 41412

Title: Consensus on the digestive endoscopic tunnel technique

Reviewer's code: 02992563

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-10-15

Date reviewed: 2018-10-19

Review time: 4 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 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

Excellent consensus on digestive endoscopic tunnel technique. Those years, it became possible to solve some surgical problems using digestive endoscopy. The advantages of digestive endoscopic tunnel technique over conventional surgery mainly lie in minimal invasion, lower cost, and shorter relief period. In this consensus, the digestive



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

endoscopic tunnel technique was well defined and described. This consensus will be a good guideline to the clinicians for using this technique. The figures and tables are informative. The manuscript is well written. No special comments. Congratulations!

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 Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 41412

Title: Consensus on the digestive endoscopic tunnel technique

Reviewer's code: 03478923

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-10-15

Date reviewed: 2018-10-25

Review time: 10 Days

| SCIENTIFIC QUALITY | LANGUAGE QUALITY | CONCLUSION | PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS |
|--|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept | Peer-Review: |
| <input checked="" 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 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

The authors have made an interesting consensus on the digestive endoscopic tunnel technique. This consensus give the clinicians a very detail guideline for this technique. It's very important and useful. No comments.



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

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 Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 41412

Title: Consensus on the digestive endoscopic tunnel technique

Reviewer's code: 02445033

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-10-15

Date reviewed: 2018-10-27

Review time: 12 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 checked="" 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

This is a consensus review on endoscopic tunnel technique, carried out by a international alliance. The idea seems appropriate because this technique is gaining ground for the treatment of some GI wall pathologies. Main comments: My main concern is about methodology for achieving consensus and grading the evidence. - The



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

methodology for consensus is not described. Was it a Delphi process or a nominal group technique? The latter is more appropriate when a few experts are participating, but for a huge group as the one described in the article a Delphi process seems more practical. We also do not know the proportion of agreement on every statement, which gives the reader an idea of the existent controversy on each topic. - How were the statements selected?. It does not seem that a PICO strategy was used. - Was a systematic review of the literature performed?. A systematic search strategy is not described. - Grading the evidence is an issue in every review. Here, a grading system is described, but no bibliographic reference is provided. Only a general reference to “evidence-based medicine”. Since this is a review on a new technology GRADE recommendations should be followed (<http://www.gradeworkinggroup.org>). - Moreover, some of the evidence grading seems to be against the description on table 1 and 2. For instance, in point 4 (“Single-tunnel ESTD and multi-tunnel ESTD”) level of evidence is stated as II. However following references, it does not seem to be any RCT but two cases reports and two case series. Therefore, this evidence should be graded as V. - Finally, participants’ affiliations should be described in detail. There is not the same experience in Western than in Asian countries, and many references are from local journals. In this kind of reviews a strong methods section is mandatory. All this issues can be managed following the ESGE’s recommendations for guideline development (Endoscopy 2012;44:626-9). Minor comments: - The structure of the manuscript is difficult to follow. The end introduction section is difficult to identify. All section headings should be in bold letters to be better identified.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[] The same title



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Duplicate publication

Plagiarism

Y] No

BPG Search:

The same title

Duplicate publication

Plagiarism

Y] No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 41412

Title: Consensus on the digestive endoscopic tunnel technique

Reviewer's code: 03478909

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-10-15

Date reviewed: 2018-10-29

Review time: 14 Days

| SCIENTIFIC QUALITY | LANGUAGE QUALITY | CONCLUSION | PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS |
|--|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept | Peer-Review: |
| <input checked="" 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 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

Very interesting and detailed consensus on the digestive endoscopic tunnel technique.
Only the references should be updated.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT



Baishideng Publishing Group

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No