

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 88371

Title: Dynamic ultrasonography for the best treatment position of superior mesenteric artery syndrome: Two case reports and review of literature

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03011144

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DNB, FACS, FICS, MBBS, MCh, MNAMS

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-02

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-17 11:49

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-17 12:14

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

1. What were the scars of the surgical procedures in pt1? 2. What was the duration of follow up in pt 2? 3. The study could have been continued by recruiting more asymptomatic individuals to document the effect of position and use of dynamic sonography. 4. Which are the pts who would benefit by non surgical means? 5. Would use of water as a contrast help in imaging better during dynamic sonography? 6. Before concluding the use of sonography in ideal positioning, more data may be required in both symptomatic and asymptomatic pts.