

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 66120

**Title:** Endoscopic hemostasis makes the difference: Angiographic treatment in patients with lower gastrointestinal bleeding

**Reviewer's code:** 05523995

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Surgical Oncologist

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** Germany

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-04-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-06 00:01

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-04-08 03:30

**Review time:** 2 Days and 3 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The manuscript has explained its methodology and results clearly and comprehensively. The authors were able to elaborate on the primary objective, to evaluate clinical predictors for angiography in patients with LGIB, and have greatly provided a well-substantiated analysis of the data they have retrospectively studied. The results and discussion did also correlate with each other. Despite being retrospective, the authors were able to provide potential evidence for the utility of angiography in the management of LGIB, especially those patients who fail endoscopic therapy.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 66120

**Title:** Endoscopic hemostasis makes the difference: Angiographic treatment in patients with lower gastrointestinal bleeding

**Reviewer's code:** 03478911

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Chief Technician, Executive Vice President, Research Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Author's Country/Territory:** Germany

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-04-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-05 20:24

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-04-13 08:15

**Review time:** 7 Days and 11 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this retrospective study, the hemostatic outcomes of angiographic treatment supplemented by catheter angiography (CA) with or without transarterial embolization (TAE) in patients with lower gastrointestinal bleeding were investigated. It needs to revise for the following issues. [Abstract] 1. What is the logical point of view of this paper? It is very contradictory. The authors have indicated the importance of interventional radiology supplemented with catheter angiography (CA) with trans-arterial embolization (TAE), but the results have proven the problems of CA, such as higher shock index and GBS, lower serum Hb, etc. 2. The aim does not match the topic at all. 3. The patients underwent TAE or not. The distinction of patients should be clarified. 4. The conclusion is blurring the points of the study. What is the clear concept of "interventional radiology" in this study? Does it mean CA with TAE? or? [Introduction] The ultimate purpose for which the authors conducted this retrospective study (solving an existing known problem? or exploring a new problem?) did not provide at all. The last paragraph: what does the mean of "further radiological treatment in the course of disease"? [Methods] 1. Although the investigation of CA alone and CA with TAE was conducted separately, there was no information. 2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria are missing. 3. The description of the statistical analysis method is missing. [Results] 1. Figure 1 does not seem to have been derived from this study. 2. How to interpret Table 1? It did not specify in the results clearly. 3. It is wondering what outcome differences could be inferred between patients in the CA-LGIB group who received TAE and those who did not. Relevant results have not been indicated or discussed. [Discussion] 1. First paragraph: Is this fact? "CA and TAE have been established as successful treatment modalities for these patients over the last few years."

The authors argue that this is not the case in this prospective study. 2. The point being discussed is unclear. It is wondering what point would like to discuss, between the positive and negative aspects of CA or CA with TAE. All results show negative clinical indicators, but it is inferred that the authors interpret them as positive.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 66120

**Title:** Endoscopic hemostasis makes the difference: Angiographic treatment in patients with lower gastrointestinal bleeding

**Reviewer's code:** 05909344

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** Germany

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-04-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-06 02:58

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-04-17 03:02

**Review time:** 11 Days

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Management of overt lower gastro-intestinal bleeding has always remained a challenge for gastroenterologists. In this regard, proposing certain measurable criteria in order to identify high risk individuals who would benefit more from early catheter angiography, as well as constructing decision trees/ flow charts, is an innovative effort done by the authors. However, there are few observations: 1. The criteria for selecting the reference/ control group is ambiguous. 2. It is unclear why endoscopic hemostasis was more successful in the reference group as opposed to the CA group. 3. The manuscript lacks a conclusion section.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 66120

**Title:** Endoscopic hemostasis makes the difference: Angiographic treatment in patients with lower gastrointestinal bleeding

**Reviewer's code:** 03478911

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Chief Technician, Executive Vice President, Research Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Author's Country/Territory:** Germany

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-04-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** Chen-Chen Gao

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-23 04:53

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-23 08:48

**Review time:** 3 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No





**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

All concerns have been well addressed. This reviewer has no additional issue to raise.