

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 82904

Title: Repeat peroral endoscopic myotomy with simultaneous submucosal and muscle dissection as a salvage option for recurrent achalasia

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03604107

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Albania

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-15 18:55

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-22 07:54

Review time: 6 Days and 12 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

It is a very interesting paper, and the medical occurrence is of importance. Treatment and diagnostic workup are convincing. I would only strongly suggest to avoid the acronym POEM; much more when added another 'S' behind (POEM-S.....). This is because there is a well known syndrome called POEMS (peripheral neuropathy, organomegaly, endocrinopathy, monoclonal plasmaproliferative disorder, skin changes). Such a double usage of the acronym POEM(S) will confuse readers. Consider using another one, or explain thoroughly in words all over the manuscript what you mean with POEM as a myotomy procedure.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 82904

Title: Repeat peroral endoscopic myotomy with simultaneous submucosal and muscle dissection as a salvage option for recurrent achalasia

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03033812

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-31 13:09

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-31 15:07

Review time: 1 Hour

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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

Lin et al. present a retrospective series of redo-POEM for recurrent achalasia. Two techniques are compared classical x simultaneous submucosal and muscle dissection that is a creation of the group. The manuscript is interesting and has some interesting data. I have 2 comments to improve the manuscript. 1) Consent to perform a procedure is NOT the same as a consent to undergo a procedure with scientific purposes. I cannot read Chinese to interpretate the IRB docs. I would like the authors to clarify if informed consent was obtained from the 16 patients for scientific purposes or it was waived due to the retrospective nature of the protocol. 2) I believe the manuscript lacks further discussion of the indications and of the results. E.g., why a redo-POEM just after the initial procedure? (0 months was the minimum time). Why not a dilatation or a Heller + fundoplication? What is the meaning of a shorter "Submucosal tunnel length"? Is it good or bad? Why the author's technique has much less reflux than the conventional technique? The drawback of POEM is GERD. If this technique promotes less GERD should be standard. Are there different indications for the 2 techniques? How patients were selected? etc, etc....

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 82904

Title: Repeat peroral endoscopic myotomy with simultaneous submucosal and muscle dissection as a salvage option for recurrent achalasia

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06087956

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MS

Professional title: Associate Professor, Chairman, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Afghanistan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-30 04:42

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-02 09:45

Review time: 3 Days and 5 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

Dear Author; Congratulations and thanks for submitting the above-mentioned interesting article (Observational study) for publication to the World Journal of Gastroenterology. I appreciate you and hope your case to be published. Comments: 1. The case is interested and well described. 2. The aim is given under the heading of AIM, but repeated at the end of introduction, it is better to delete the repeated point. 3. Discussion needs paragraph rearrangement, since discussion-related literature review is mentioned first, and then your findings are compared and described 4. The manuscript needs minor linguistic and grammatical polishing.