

**ESPS Peer-review Report**

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7256

**Title:** Gastroenteric Tube Feeding: Techniques, Problems and Solutions

**Reviewer code:** 02515792

**Science editor:** Zhai, Huan-Huan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-11-13 10:48

**Date reviewed:** 2013-11-20 00:02

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 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)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input 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 manuscript represents a narrative review of enteral feeding techniques and complications. The stated focus/purpose of this review is to "provide an overview of the current status of endoscopic enteral tube feeding". Overall the manuscript depicts a solid picture of enteral feeding and complications but it suffers from inconsistent coherence in writing and lack of some rigor in scientific reporting style. Some examples follow. 1. Abstracts/Methods: It is helpful to specify the time frame of the literature review. Especially given the overall aim to address the 'current' status of ETF. Also, why only two literature databases? Most reviews are more comprehensive. Suggest more detail on the search process. 2. Abstract/Results: Suggest the 4 major categories of complications be followed throughout the manuscript. These items are introduced unequally at different points in the review but the overall presentation across techniques is unbalanced. If this is the 'current status' the authors should state this from the outset. 3. Body of manuscript: A consistent reporting format will help the reader follow the authors' intent. Perhaps consistent use of subheadings such as technique defined, clinical indications, techniques and variations, complications, treatment of complications. The manuscript as presented separates procedure and complications with the strongest and most clear presentation being the complications section. The brief section on the role of the NST is almost parenthetical to the remaining text. Perhaps this information could become part of an expanded introduction with roles delineated for each ETF method? The first sentence in the conclusions does not seem warranted...endoscopy has facilitated .....perhaps because the focus on endoscopy is not clear in the body of the manuscript...and/or perhaps because this focus is not clarified in the abstract or elsewhere. 4. References: The reference list is extensive but covers a wide span of years. If the focus is truly to review the current status...perhaps the writing focus and the literature review could



## **Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited**

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

---

emphasize recent developments.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7256

**Title:** Gastroenteric Tube Feeding: Techniques, Problems and Solutions

**Reviewer code:** 00504182

**Science editor:** Zhai, Huan-Huan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-11-13 10:48

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-02 01:30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[ Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ Y] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] No records	[ Y] Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a review article on enteral feeding techniques. It is quite well organized, but it suffers of imbalance between the separate procedures and the complications section. Moreover, the role of endoscopy in the enteral feeding is not adequately described in the text. Finally, as a comprehensive review paper, references must be updated and recent articles of the most recent developments must be cited and described in the text.