

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 83931

Title: The knowledge, attitude, and practice of monitoring early gastric cancer after

endoscopic submucosal dissection

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05232287 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-16

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-16 17:18

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-16 19:59

**Review time:** 2 Hours

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	[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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

YANG CY et al reported an elegant and novel study aiming at examine the knowledge, attitude, and practice (KAP) of EGC survivors following ESD regarding gastric cancer recurrence. They concluded that EGC survivors showed inadequate knowledge, positive attitude, and poor practices in monitoring recurrences after ESD. Adequate knowledge, positive attitude, and longer time since the last ESD are associated with practice. The issue is very novel, and the article is very well organized and simple to read. - The introduction section appears well designed. some issues remain to be addressed: - I recommend to add the reference 10.4251/wjgo.v8.i1.40 to the sentence [...] Helicobacter pylori are one of the main risk factors for gastric cancer as it induces inflammatory responses in the stomach as well as genetic and epigenetic changes that lead to genetic instability in gastric epithelial cells. Eradication of H. pylori would eliminate a major cause of cancer death worldwide [...] Anyway, there is a lack of the literature supporting the clinical relevance and clinical needs of precancerous condition/lesion and gastric cancer in patients with primary gastric lymphoma . I strongly suggest Authors to add some sentences about current literature as regard this issue. It will add



more credibility to your paper. Discussion - I strongly suggest to add more clear sentences regarding the clinical implication of KAP.



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 83931

Title: The knowledge, attitude, and practice of monitoring early gastric cancer after

endoscopic submucosal dissection

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05348255 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

**Professional title:** Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-16

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-14 11:02

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-14 11:38

Review time: 1 Hour

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



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

# SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

-The study design is need for major handling, you mention that the study was conduced between Aug and Oct and this not accurate -The patients of ESD should instructed strictly about the follow up and the lack of knowledge is a major defect in role of endoscopists and healthcare givers towards the patients as this issue is very critical for the patients. -in the discussion you mentioned a lot of data about HP and its role in gastric cancer and HP not related to study as you discuss another things and this should be deleted to be concassed in your topic



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 83931

Title: The knowledge, attitude, and practice of monitoring early gastric cancer after

endoscopic submucosal dissection

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03806663 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD

**Professional title:** Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-16

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-15 17:40

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-17 20:13

**Review time:** 2 Days and 2 Hours

	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] 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



https://www.wjgnet.com

Scientific significance of the	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair
conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language
Language quality	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 statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [ Y] No

# SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a nice work that discusses hot object. but more studies that interact with the patient face to face is more important. Also, the guidelines should be updated to include post ESD patients.



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 83931

Title: The knowledge, attitude, and practice of monitoring early gastric cancer after

endoscopic submucosal dissection

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05449319 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-16

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-14 08:00

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-21 19:59

**Review time:** 7 Days and 11 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



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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] 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

This study entitled "The knowledge, attitude, and practice of monitoring early gastric cancer (EGC) after endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD)" is the first study to examine the KAP regarding monitoring of gastric cancer recurrence after ESD. But this study needs more clarification for better understanding. Materials & methods - You recruited 400 EGC survivors for your study. How did you calculate the sample size? -Patients were recruited by telephone calls from the hospital. Patients who agreed to participate in this study were surveyed when they came to the hospital for follow-up. After the questionnaire survey was completed, investigators assessed the completeness, internal continuity, and rationality of the questionnaire. In the case of missing questions, investigators asked patients to answer them. How do you ask for missing data? Through phone or do you ask them to come to hospital? Were there any patients who did not come for follow-up? - You mentioned the scoring system for knowledge, attitude and practice. But how do you categorize into inadequate knowledge or good attitude or poor practice? 3.34 out of 5 was categorized as inadequate knowledge, 23.76 out of 30 was categorized as good attitude and 5.75 out of 11 as poor practice. Do you have any



criteria for categorization? Discussion - Discuss in detail why there was good attitude but inadequate knowledge and poor practice?



# RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 83931

Title: The knowledge, attitude, and practice of monitoring early gastric cancer after

endoscopic submucosal dissection

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05348255 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

**Professional title:** Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-16

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-23 02:38

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-23 02:42

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ Y] 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

No specific comments