

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 75731

Title: Usefulness of analyzing endoscopic features in identifying the colorectal serrated sessile lesions with and without dysplasia

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05194798

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Director

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-07-08

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-22 21:17

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-25 21:18

Review time: 3 Days

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	[Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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



Baishideng

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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	 [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] 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) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection 	
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No	
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No	

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript is an original article that retrospectively investigated the endoscopic features in identifying the colorectal serrated sessile lesions with dysplasia, by compared with SSLs without dysplasia. This study showed that reddish color, a microvascular varicose and mixed pattern of crypt opening were the independent predictors for SSLs with dysplasia by multifactorial logistic regression analysis. This study was conducted well, and the methods are appropriate. The results will be of interest to clinicians in the field. However, the following major and minor issues require clarification: Major 1. Previous studies have already reported the endoscopic characteristics in SSLs with dysplasia. The authors should comment the strength (novelty and originality) in this Minor 1. An abbreviation of SSL is used for two meanings, that is, serrated study. sessile lesion in a broad sense and serrated sessile lesion without dysplasia, which seems somewhat confusing. Please modify the latter one. 2. (P8L13-15) "The independent diagnostic factors of colorectal SSL-D serve as positive guidelines for the colonoscopist's immediate endoscopic diagnosis." This sentence should be described in the discussion section as it is not a result. 3. (Discussion) The first paragraph should be described in



Introduction section. 4. (P12L3-4) "Second, all cases included in this study were precancerous adenocarcinomas, which could lead to discrepancies in the findings." I can't understand this description of limitation. Please explain it in more detail.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases Manuscript NO: 75731 Title: Usefulness of analyzing endoscopic features in identifying the colorectal serrated sessile lesions with and without dysplasia Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed Peer-review model: Single blind **Reviewer's code:** 05194798 **Position:** Editorial Board Academic degree: MD **Professional title:** Director Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan Author's Country/Territory: China Manuscript submission date: 2023-07-08 Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang Reviewer accepted review: 2023-09-12 06:01 Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-12 06:17 Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous





statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for revising the manuscript according to my suggestion. The revised manuscript is improved enough to be accepted.