Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [Y] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The review of the manuscript: Endoscopic versus Radiologic gastrostomy for enteral feeding: a systematic review and meta-analysis The authors submitted the first systematic review on comparing two mostly used techniques for introducing feeding tubes. Numbered comments: 1. The fonts of the text should be equivalent trough the manuscript, there are also some typo errors. 2. The introduction is to short and it should mention also surgical gastrostomy procedures. Surgical technique is mentioned at the discussion part where I believe it is not necessary. 3. What is the reason to exclude pediatric studies ? However, I believe that you should exclude studies with PEGJ. 4. In my opinion it is to many tables, however the text can be longer.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors aimed to compare Endoscopic gastrostomy (PEG) and Radiologic gastrostomy (PRG) for enteral feeding concerning the complication. They selected comparative studies of PEG and PRG following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systemic Reviews and Meta-analyses guidelines. They disclosed that the only outcome that showed a significant difference was tube related complications. They concluded that PEG has lower levels of tube-related complications (such as dislocation, leak, obstruction, or breakdown) when compared to PRG. This manuscript appears nearly acceptable for publication, but there should be a more thorough discussion about the hypotheses that PRG caused tube-related complications more frequently. Furthermore, there are several grammatical and spelling errors, e.g. e 17 (lines 4 of 1st paragraph of Discussion), although (lines 17 of 9th paragraph of Discussion), Strengths (lines 4 of 10th paragraph of Discussion).