

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 80310

Title: An update on endoscopic techniques for gastric neuroendocrine tumors

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06337392

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-01 20:26

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-13 16:26

Review time: 11 Days and 20 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish	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 	
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No	
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous	



Baishideng Baishideng Publishing

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

In general, this review is well conducted and I would not change the scheme or the order of the paragraphs. I think it is precise and complete. Nevertheless, some minor comments are needed. I would quote and integrate the results of three other relevant and recent papers: • "Borbath I, Garcia-Carbonero R, Bikmukhametov D, Jimenez-Fonseca P, Castaño A, Barkmanova J, Sedlackova E, Kollár A, Christ E, Kaltsas G, Kos-Kudla B, Maasberg S, Verslype C, Pape UF. The European Neuroendocrine Tumour Society registry, a tool to assess the prognosis of neuroendocrine neoplasms. Eur J Cancer. 2022 Jun;168:80-90. doi: 10.1016/j.ejca.2022.03.007. Epub 2022 Apr 23. PMID: 35472579." • Sun W, Wu S, Han X, Yang C. Effectiveness of Endoscopic Treatment for Gastrointestinal Neuroendocrine Tumors: A Retrospective Study. Medicine (Baltimore). 2016 Apr;95(15):e3308. doi: 10.1097/MD.00000000003308. PMID: 27082572; PMCID: PMC4839816. • Xue L, Cai Y, Chen W, Chen S, Xue P. Clinical Spectrum and Endoscopic Treatment of Gastrointestinal Carcinoid Tumour. J Coll Physicians Surg Pak. 2022 Oct;32(10):1330-1333. doi: 10.29271/jcpsp.2022.10.1330. PMID: 36205280. In chapter "Traditional EMR", at line 4 ("EMR, as mentioned earlier, has a lower rate of incomplete resection") please explain better what EMR is compared to. In chapter "Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection", when you described the results of the study conduct by Kim et al. about the comparison between ESD and EMR, explain better the reasons of less affection of vertical margins in patients who underwent ESD. It is not clear. Please provide the entire meaning of LNM, I could not find in the text.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 80310

Title: An update on endoscopic techniques for gastric neuroendocrine tumors

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05759436

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-25

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-24 00:10

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-24 00:24

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	 [] 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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection 	
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No	
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous	



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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This narrative review was comprehensively updated the knowledge on the endoscopic

treatment options to manage g-NENs.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 80310

Title: An update on endoscopic techniques for gastric neuroendocrine tumors

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05352073

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Director, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-25

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-19 15:39

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-31 04:30

Review time: 11 Days and 12 Hours

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



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) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear author: Congratulations! You have given us an informative and detailed narrative article about Gastric neuroendocrine neoplasms, especially the classification and treatments. As a narrative review, although there is no knowledge gap, the detailed information in the manuscript is of substantial reference value for clinical physicians. However, there are some recommendations for you. For the title, I recommend to remove the word "novel" in the title, strictly speaking, the manuscript described numerous conventional endoscopic techniques as well. As an update on novel endoscopic techniques, I recommend that in the introduction part, it would be better to describe what is the conventional concept of treatment and what is the novel concept of treatment. That will make the manuscript more significant and logic. As the abstract consisted of "background", "aim", "method", "results", "conclusion", the main text should also consist of such same parts. In the method part, it would be better to describe the literature searching method. As many endoscopic techniques were described. I recommend to have a table, illuminate the different characteristic of the three types of gNENs, such as, proportion, origin, malignant proportion, guideline for



treatment, et al. as the article is pretty informative, only select key information in the table. That would be more helpful for the readers.