Baishideng Publishing Group

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 52017

Title: Recent advances in diagnostic upper endoscopy

Reviewer's code: 01221925

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's country: Greece

Author's country: Singapore

Reviewer chosen by: Artificial Intelligence Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-10-17 20:03

Reviewer performed review: 2019-10-17 20:16

Review time: 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[Y] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting review of recent developments addressing several important issues

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

in the role of diagnostic upper endoscopy with a focus on diagnosing early gastric cancer. Could the authors please respond to the following questions/comments: 1) From the 306 papers identified, how were the 106 abstracts chosen for review and from these the 67 papers to include in the study? They provide a Prisma diagram but it should be made clear in the text 2) The authors do not need to mention in the introduction their findings regarding the duration of the endoscopy as this is repeated later in the results 3) The authors mention that there are existing guidelines but they are "cumbersome and often not followed". Although this may be true, the authors should a) state why their work is more important or should replace these guidelines, which are usually the result of a very thorough process and b) specifically list in a table or in the text what their conclusions are

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No