

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 540

**Title:** Single endoscopist performed percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy tube placement

**Reviewer code:** 00503976

**Science editor:** Huang, Xin-Zhen

**Date sent for review:** 2012-09-17 09:34

**Date reviewed:** 2012-09-27 16:11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear author, Thank you for submitting your manuscript. Comments: 1. There are some spelling errors throughout the manuscript, please run a spell check program to correct these along with some english grammar mistakes. 2. It is not clear in the text that during the "single endoscopist" performed PEG procedure, who is grabbing the guide wire? Does the endoscopist take the endoscope over again or the nurse is doing this? Regards

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 540

**Title:** Single endoscopist performed percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy tube placement

**Reviewer code:** 00036747

**Science editor:** Huang, Xin-Zhen

**Date sent for review:** 2012-09-17 09:34

**Date reviewed:** 2012-10-08 19:12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is very interesting, but I have some comments. Major comments 1, The author should compare to two person methods. 2, After PEG 20 patients died within 3 months, please display indication of PEG. Minor comments 1, The authors divided the best location of PEG using finger pressing, but Japan best location point was divided using ultrasound. 2, page 6, according to bleeding, please add the information of anticoagulant agents