

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

**Manuscript NO:** 78103

**Title:** Study of preoperative diagnostic modalities in Chinese patients with superficial esophageal squamous cell carcinoma

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05461735

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Surgeon

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-06-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-06-10 08:13

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-06-21 14:21

**Review time:** 11 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

The authors investigated the diagnostic ability of the depth of esophageal cancer by EUS and ME. However, some vital detail should be clarified. 1. How many endoscopists participate in this study? 2. What is their experience with magnifying endoscopy and EUS? 3. The authors used NBI or BLI for ME. They are not the same. Is there any difference in accuracy between those two systems? 4. In real-life practice, one endoscopist typically prefers one system (NBI or BLI). What is the endoscopists' preference in the authors' endoscopy center? 5. Because of the retrospective design, some of the ME and EUS was performed by junior endoscopists. What is the definition of "junior"? Did it include "trainee"? Did it affect the diagnostic accuracy? 6. There are misspellings in this manuscript. (Ex. Table 2 NE-NBI/BLI ) Please carefully check before submission. 7. The aim of this study is to investigate what is better between ME and EUS, but the diagnosis of the depth of esophageal cancer should be ME in the standard guideline. The additionally EUS will help or not is up to the ME expertise of endoscopists. EUS could not be better than ME, but EUS with ME could be better.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

**Manuscript NO:** 78103

**Title:** Study of preoperative diagnostic modalities in Chinese patients with superficial esophageal squamous cell carcinoma

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06109343

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-06-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-06-23 00:16

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-07-06 00:37

**Review time:** 13 Days

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" 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



**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>

<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
-------------------------------------	---

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

Comments How many lesions examined by NBI (Olympus endoscope) and how many lesions examined by BLI (Fujinon endoscope)? Is there a difference in accuracy between them? Also how many lesions examined by radial EUS or miniproboscopes? Still not clear how can EUS differentiate between the stage of MM/SM1, and SM2/SM3. What will be the diagnostic accuracy of both techniques, ME and EUS if added to each other? Would the accuracy will increase if compared to each modality alone? If so, you can recommend combination of both techniques in these patients. What about the diagnostic accuracy of “lifting sign” during ER? You should mention that EUS has the advantage of detecting and even sampling local lymph nodes not seen by CT or MRI. Still English editing is needed.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

**Manuscript NO:** 78103

**Title:** Study of preoperative diagnostic modalities in Chinese patients with superficial esophageal squamous cell carcinoma

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05461735

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Surgeon

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-06-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yun-Xiaojuan Wu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-08-12 10:53

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-08-13 22:40

**Review time:** 1 Day and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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>

statements

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

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

The authors responded well to both reviewers' questions. I have no additional questions.