

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 88725

Title: Endoscopic submucosal dissection for early gastric cancer: It is time to consider the quality of its outcomes

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03474116

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: AGAF, MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-10-08 22:26

Reviewer performed review: 2023-10-09 11:45

Review time: 13 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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

General: This Editorial was well written Comments: 1. As reference 5, authors introduced the Korean clinical guideline for gastric cancer. Is criteria for indication of gastric cancer for ESD similar over the world? 2. Not all patients achieve curative resection after ESD of EGC, which is a critical problem. Authors should mention about risk factor of patients with problem for gastric ESD. 3. Authors mentioned NBI. How about IEE, such as LCI, BLI and TXI, for detection and evaluation for gastric cancer? 4. Please mention about H. pylori infection status for detection and evaluation of gastric cancer? Is it better to eradicate H. pylori infection before ESD? 5. Compared with surgical gastrectomy, ESD is a mini-mal invasive procedure with additional advantages such as preserving the entire stomach and maintaining of the patient's quality of life. I agree. However, authors should explain adverse events of ESD. 6. Please add references in each quality indication of Table 1.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 88725

Title: Endoscopic submucosal dissection for early gastric cancer: It is time to consider the quality of its outcomes

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03656594

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: DA, MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-10-15 11:20

Reviewer performed review: 2023-10-15 13:12

Review time: 1 Hour

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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

I am glad to see this excellent manuscript. This article is innovative and can somewhat guide the next direction of clinical research. This manuscript deals with the quality indicators of ESD of EGCs. But the identification of these indicators in the final table still seems to be not rigorous enough and needs to be supported by more studies or references. Moreover, the two indicators regarding the ESD complications section, post-ESD bleeding and perforation, are not presented in the article and seem to appear directly in the table. Also, some of the references in this paper are not from the last 5 years and I hope they can be modified as appropriate.