

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 49998

Title: Endoscopic full-thickness resection for treating small tumors originating from the muscularis propria in the gastric fundus: An improvement in technique over 15 years

Reviewer's code: 00001114

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-07-12 03:54

Reviewer performed review: 2019-07-15 08:14

Review time: 3 Days and 4 Hours

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" 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

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review the manuscript: "Endoscopic full-thickness resection for treating small tumors originating from the muscularis propria in the gastric fundus: An improvement in technique over 15 years". I have

following some comments. #1 The authors should explain the initial endoscopic band ligation method because initial methods did not include tumor resection. I feel this make the readers confused. #2 The authors described the initial ligation method had the relatively the high risk of post-ligation perforation of the gastric fundus¹⁻³. However, Ref¹ and 2 (Surg Endosc 2007;21:574-8. Gastrointest Endosc 2004;60:218-22.) said that no perforation occurred. So the authors had better cite only Ref 3. #3 The authors should explain the importance of endoscopic resection for small MP tumors. In this study, the authors intend to include patients with tumors located in the gastric fornix of the fundus. I was wondering there was no indication for endoscopic full-thickness resection for MP tumors in other parts of the stomach. #4 Although there is a variety of discussion because MP tumors include no malignancy tumor or non-neoplasm like this study result, I think the pathological evaluation including cut-end negativeness, in particular, in case of GIST, is very important. The authors should clarify the definition of en-bloc resection and show pathological cut end results including pathological pictures. #5 Finally, the authors should discuss to compare those 3 methods including pathological evaluation. #6 It seems there are no units in Tabel 2.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, 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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 49998

Title: Endoscopic full-thickness resection for treating small tumors originating from the muscularis propria in the gastric fundus: An improvement in technique over 15 years

Reviewer's code: 02510721

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-07-12 06:36

Reviewer performed review: 2019-07-18 07:39

Review time: 6 Days and 1 Hour

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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 study shows the comparison of the results between some endoscopic techniques for the treatment of muscularis propria small tumors. The technical characteristics and details of each procedure are well described and also the results. In the Discussion the



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

most important technical features of the procedures are developed. In my opinion should be useful to add more data on the preoperative diagnosis about the signs, symptoms, endoscopic and imaging characteristics. In summary the manuscript needs minor modifications.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No