

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 82936

Title: Utility of Single-Balloon Enteroscopy Overtubes in Massive Upper Gastrointestinal

Bleeding

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05077783

**Position:** Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, MSc

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-06 03:56

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-08 02:07

Review time: 1 Day and 22 Hours

	[ ] 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	[Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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 this manuscript	<ul> <li>[] Grade A: Excellent</li> <li>[] Grade B: Good</li> <li>[Y] Grade C: Fair</li> <li>[] Grade D: No creativity or innovation</li> </ul>



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors report a case of removal of massive intragastric clotting using an enteroscopy overtube. The report is of relative scientific interest, as it describes a novel technical variation for the treatment of a relatively common condition. While the use of an enteroscopy overtube was not previously described, other types of overtube are used for the removal of massive intragastric clots. Writing in the english language needs significant reviewing, in sentences such as this: on page 1 line 6 "The bleeding site"; page 1 line 29 "This appears"; page 2 line 37 "is a commonly"; page 2 line 39 "clear vision of the gastrointestinal tract"; page 3 line 91 " after successfully removing". Why was a fecal occult blood test performed on this patient?



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 82936

Title: Utility of Single-Balloon Enteroscopy Overtubes in Massive Upper Gastrointestinal

Bleeding

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05394499

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Germany

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-06 07:13

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-06 11:53

Review time: 4 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	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair</li> <li>[ ] Grade D: No scientific significance</li> </ul>
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	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, thank you very much for your well-written manuscript. Please pay attention to the following questions and queries: 1. Line 30: please correct us such: or failed to remove. 2. Line 73: did you substitute fibrinogen and other coagulation factors during the emergency management of the gastrointestinal bleeding? 3. Line 92: please mention how many clips did you use to stop the bleeding. 4. Line 96: where was the ulcer located? 5. Line 96: please correct us such: due to a gastric ulcer. 6. Line 104: did you take any biopsies during the follow-up endoscopy? 7. Discussion: please discuss why you have not decided to perform a CT-angiography in order to locate the bleeding and take hemostatic measures. Best Regards