

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 87119

Title: Efficacy and safety of gastroscopic hemostasis in the treatment of acute gastric hemorrhage: A meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07746165

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Germany

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-29 09:54

Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-10 13:24

Review time: 12 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

Acute bleeding is a common clinical complication of Gastric cancer. Gastroscopic hemostasis is the preferred treatment for acute gastric cancer bleeding, although there is little evidence to support the use of endoscopic hemostatic treatment for acute gastric cancer bleeding. The efficacy and safety of endoscopic hemostasis in the treatment of acute gastric cancer bleeding remains highly controversial. Some doctors believe that gastroscopy increases the risk of rebleeding. So in this meta-analysis, Haiyan Pan and his colleagues systematically evaluate the efficacy and safety of gastroscopic hemostasis in the treatment of acute gastric cancer hemorrhage. They found that both the efficacy and safety of endoscopic hemostasis were increased in the treatment groups compared to treated with conventional drugs. The manuscript is a good meta-analysis. Good Introduction and materials and Methods. Discussion is well articulated according to results and the authors have clearly underlined the limitations and drawbacks of the manuscript. However, the discussion is still somewhat too brief, and it is recommended to add a discussion on the study of the mechanisms of similar diseases. Complete the References.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 87119

Title: Efficacy and safety of gastroscopic hemostasis in the treatment of acute gastric hemorrhage: A meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07746562

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Research Associate

Reviewer's Country/Territory: South Korea

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-28 07:26

Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-10 14:13

Review time: 13 Days and 6 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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
Peer-reviewer statements	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

This is an interesting a series of retrospective studies meta-analysis. The research ideas are clear and the work is serious. The result of the study is of interest that authors found that endoscopic hemostasis effectively controls acute gastric bleeding in gastric cancer, significantly reducing the bleeding and transfer rates, indicating a higher success rate of endoscopic hemostasis in treating patients with acute gastric bleeding in gastric cancer. Overall, this study was well conducted with good methodology and intelligible English. I suggest to accept it, but it needs to be improved in the following aspects. 1. The definitions of control group and experimental group need to be clarified in the method section of the summary, otherwise the understanding is unclear. 2. Figure 1 is not mentioned in the main text. 3. Please enrich the discussion section of the article. 4. The references referenced in the table shall be checked, and the sequence number is incorrect. For example, sheibani[17] is mentioned in the table, but the study done by Sheibani et al. in 2013 numbered 16 in the REFERENCES. Please check the full text.