

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 27176

Title: Roux-en-Y daugmented gastric advancement: An alternative technique for concurrent esophageal and pyloric stenosis secondary to corrosive intake

Reviewer's code: 03317069

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-05-17 15:06

Date reviewed: 2016-06-09 21:36

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments To Authors World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery. ESPS Manuscript NO: 27176
 Title: Roux-en-Y Augmented Gastric Advancement (RAGA): An Alternative Technique for Concurrent Esophageal and Pyloric Stenosis Secondary to Corrosive Intake The authors describe an alternative technique where they utilize stomach following distal gastric resection along with Roux-en-Y reconstruction instead of colonic or jejunal interposition. This is a carefully done study and the findings are of considerable interest. For the benefit of the reader, however, a number of points need modifying. These are given below. 1. The authors experienced 3 cases of using RAGA method. However, the authors showed only one case in the manuscript. The authors should show or describe the two other cases. 2. One of the three patients passed away due to pneumonia in the early stage after operation. Is there any relationship to surgical procedure? Did the patient show any symptom such as stenosis or dysmotility of GI tract. 3. (Discussion, Page 6, Line 4-6) "Finally, this reconstruction plan can be of enormous value if the colon is not available for interposition due to some other concomitant reason like ulcerative colitis or Crohn's disease." It



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

seems to be relatively rare to occur concurrent esophageal and gastric stricturing due to corrosive intake for ulcerative colitis or Crohn's disease patients. Did three patients have any problems or diseases of their colon? 4. It seems to be difficult to understand the advantage of RAGA in Table 1. The comparison between two methods is not clear. The authors should show concrete frequency in each category.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 27176

Title: Roux-en-Y daugmented gastric advancement: An alternative technique for concurrent esophageal and pyloric stenosis secondary to corrosive intake

Reviewer's code: 00004485

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-05-17 15:06

Date reviewed: 2016-06-04 04:39

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Please see suggested grammar changes throughout the manuscript. 2. You cannot claim that your patients had an excellent outcome when one died postoperatively. See suggested change in the manuscript. 3. What was the incidence of dumping syndrome in the 2 surviving patients in this series? 4. Most thoracic surgeons will transect much of the greater curvature of the stomach at time of esophageal resection and cervical gastric anastomosis. Please comment on why this was not done as it precludes gastric stasis, erosions, and reflux. Presumably, the authors were concerned about gastric ischemia.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 27176

Title: Roux-en-Y daugmented gastric advancement: An alternative technique for concurrent esophageal and pyloric stenosis secondary to corrosive intake

Reviewer's code: 03025728

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-05-17 15:06

Date reviewed: 2016-06-12 16:53

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall it is a globally good written case-report with an interesting topic. since it is a operational method not performed before- it is worth to assess. It is acceptable for publication. Thank you in advance