



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 65589

Title: Six intragastric balloons: Which to choose?

Reviewer's code: 05261629

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-10

Reviewer chosen by: Man Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-13 08:28

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-19 17:22

Review time: 6 Days and 8 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 Grade E: Do not publish
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



**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

Interesting review, on a topic that is still quite debated today. Adding some figures might be interesting



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 65589

Title: Six intragastric balloons: Which to choose?

Reviewer's code: 00504581

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Attending Doctor, Doctor, Medical Assistant,
Staff Physician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-10

Reviewer chosen by: Man Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-26 06:52

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-04 19:39

Review time: 9 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
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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

This is a thorough review of a topic with a lot of publications and RCTs during the last 30 years, very well known by the bariatric medical gastroenterologist, but not for the rest of the physicians. The authors try to show the pros and cons of the different intragastric balloon evolution and development, analysing the published literature and the different guidelines, to make easier the reader the appropriate choice. The review is very well done, but we miss the author's final statement and conclusions about (in their opinion) which balloon we should choose and what the reasons are and why, in the different clinical situations

THERE ARE SOME OTHER THINGS TO IMPROVE SUCH AS:

INTRODUCTION The third paragraph “..... have emerged over the years, to provide less invasive options beyond lifestyle modifications, pharmacotherapy, and surgery, for patients who have failed with conservative treatment and are not or not yet surgical candidates, or refuse surgery because of its invasiveness and fear of complications[12,18].” The authors should include the general indications and contraindications, and with special reference to BMI measures. Second paragraph

BALLOON DESCRIPTION “.... inserted orally into the gastric fundus and a volume of 500 to 700 mL saline solution - adjusted to the BMI of the individual -” Therefore if you said that, you should add and explain what filling volume is needed for what BMI intervals? Third paragraph Emptying must be changed for emptying. Fifth paragraph “.....]. The balloon is generally well-tolerated during the 6 months implantation period. However, its use has raised several concerns about procedure-related complications and technical difficulties, especially”. It is important to describe which are the “technical difficulties”, because this is a review article. Sixth paragraph “.....Unique contraindications for the gas-filled balloons are scuba diving and travel in unpressurized airplane cabins[5].” ...besides the other intragastric balloon general



**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

contraindications The classical Orbera Second paragraph "...Similarly, there was no association between balloon filling volume and early removal rates, gastroesophageal reflux, or gastric ulcer rates." Perhaps It should be enumerated and described the rates number of complications and to describe them. DISCUSSION paragraph 2 "... who qualifies for bariatric surgery but has uncontrolled co-morbidities causing her/him to be of high-risk for anesthesia and surgery or denied anesthesia and/or surgery, or its use as a bridge to bariatric surgery, and" However this indication and their results have not been commented for any of the balloons evaluated. And I think this special indication should be also presented and discussed referring to the balloon employed. Besides the description of the different types of the intragastric balloon, it would be convenient to add illustrations of all types of balloons ("an image worth more than a thousand words"), to make easier the understanding of the way of working of each balloon. This report conveys a lot of data from many publications RCTs etc, and it would be necessary a summary that conveys the author's opinion and conclusion. Especially regarding the new balloons filled with air, that no deserve the intervention of endoscopic procedure Then the reader will agree or disagree and will draw their conclusions. I miss a true conclusion and should be added a summary or conclusion with the author's thoughts and recommendations.