

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 64837

**Title:** Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection vs Endoscopic Mucosal Resection for Colorectal Polyps. A Meta-Analysis and Meta-Regression with Single Arm Analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 04213276

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc

**Professional title:** Research Associate

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Greece

**Author's Country/Territory:** Singapore

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-02-24

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-02-25 18:18

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-02-26 09:36

**Review time:** 15 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	[ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Grade A: Excellent [ <input type="radio"/> ] Grade B: Very good [ <input type="radio"/> ] Grade C: Good [ <input type="radio"/> ] Grade D: Fair [ <input type="radio"/> ] Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	[ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ <input type="radio"/> ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ <input type="radio"/> ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ <input type="radio"/> ] Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	[ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Accept (High priority) [ <input type="radio"/> ] Accept (General priority) [ <input type="radio"/> ] Minor revision [ <input type="radio"/> ] Major revision [ <input type="radio"/> ] Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	[ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input type="radio"/> ] No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is a thoroughly researched and well executed meta-analysis. The authors have provided feedback on a significant endoscopic subject and have done that by performing significant sub-analyses and covering a substantial number of aspects that may influence EMR/ESD success. I highly recommend this article for publication. Minor changes: -  
The conclusions in the abstract should include the comparison between ESD and EMR and not focus on differences between Japan and the rest of world.