

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Authors presented two cases of Laparoscopic Janeway gastrostomy along with evidenced based medicine. This is very interesting. This work is technically sound. You have reached definite outcomes which are based on your experiments. The title reflects the main hypothesis of the manuscript. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. The keywords reflect the focus of the manuscript. A core tip has been given which justifies the need for this case report and is appreciable. The manuscript describes the background, present status, and significance of the study. The manuscript describes methods in adequate detail. The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly, and logically. It discusses the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently. This work has been tailored with available literature. The figures, diagrams, and tables are sufficient, good quality, and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. The figures are labeled with arrows, asterisks, etc. This is a case report and thus the manuscript meets the requirements of biostatistics without any testing of hypothesis. The manuscript cites appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections. The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented and the style, language, and grammar are accurate and appropriate. PRISMA is used for the evidence-based medicine, systematic review and meta-analysis. The author prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. Informed written consent was obtained from the patient for publication of this report and accompanying images. I appreciate your work which would be greatly useful in populations requiring enteral access.

Response to Reviewer #1: Thank you very much for your positive comments. We greatly appreciate you advocating for acceptance of our manuscript to be published in this journal.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: They successfully performed two laparoscopic Janeway gastrostomy (LJG) procedures, after which They conducted a literature review of all documented cases of LJG from 1991 to 2022. They surveyed these cases to show the efficacy of LJG and provide comparisons to other existing procedures with primary outcomes of operative time, complications, duration of gastrostomy use, and application settings. Results: They presented two cases of LJG, detailing the simplicity and benefits of this technique. They subsequently identified 26 articles and 56 cases of LJG and extrapolated the data relating to our outcome measures. They could show the potential of LJG as a viable and preferred option in certain patient populations requiring enteral access, drawing reference to its favorable outcome profile and low complication rate. Conclusions: The LJG is a simple, reproducible procedure with a favorable complication profile. By its technical ease and benefits relating to the gastric tube formed, They propose this procedure as a viable, favorable enteral access in patients with the

need for permanent or palliative gastrostomy, those with neurologic disease, agitation, or at high risk of gastrostomy dislodgement, or where PEG may be infeasible. In General: it's a good paper and the subject of the manuscript is applicable and useful. Title: the title properly explain the purpose and objective of the article Abstract: abstract contains an appropriate summary for the article, language used in the abstract is easy to read and understand, there are no suggestions for improvement. Introduction: authors do provide adequate background on the topic and reason for this article and describe what the authors hoped to achieve. Results: the results are presented clearly, the authors provide accurate research results, there is sufficient evidence for each result. Conclusion: in general: Good and the research provides sample data for the authors to make their conclusion. Grammar: Need Some revision. (Check The Paper Comments). Please provide the following information in the Paper 1. Conflict of Interest 2. Source of Funding Finally, this was an appealing article, in its current state it adds much new insightful information to the field. Therefore, I accept that paper to be published in your journal

Response to Reviewer #2: Thank you very much for your positive comments. We greatly appreciate you advocating for acceptance of our manuscript to be published in this journal. We have corrected the suggested edits by native speakers of English.