PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 87918

Title: Nomogram to predict gas-related complications during transoral endoscopic resection of upper gastrointestinal submucosal lesions

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05371771

Position: Editor-in-Chief

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chairman, Director, Full Professor, Senior Editor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: South Korea

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-09-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-09-10 07:18

Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-11 09:01

Review time: 1 Day and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[　] Grade A: Excellent　　[　] Grade B: Good　　　[Y] Grade C: Fair [　] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[　] Grade A: Priority publishing　[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing　[　] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing　[　] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[　] Accept (High priority)　[　] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision　[　] Major revision　[　] Rejection
Re-review	[　] Yes　[Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [　] Anonymous　[Y] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [　] Yes　[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The limitations are well pointed out, but even within the same institution, the results could have been different depending on the competence of the endoscopists performing the procedure.　　Also, in the conclusion, DM was used as a significant predictor, but in the table, the calculation guidance should have been 50%, but it was incorrectly shown as 0.5, so it will be important to check if it is actually correct.　　Translated with www.DeepL.com/Translator (free version)