

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 834

Title: Endoscopic papillectomy - indications, results & long-term follow-up of a systematic prospective observational study (case series progression report)

Reviewer code: 00004882

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2012-10-18 14:09

Date reviewed: 2012-11-05 08:17

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)	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper describes the results of endoscopic papillectomy in 54 patients. This procedure is not common and therefore the results are important. Although the paper is well written, it includes several problems as shown below. 1) In adenoma, a tumor recurrence rate was 13.6% (n=3/22). What kind of treatment was performed for them and how about the results? 2) In malignant lesions, a recurrence rate was 20%. What kind of treatment was performed for them and how about the results? 3) Conclusion is too long and does not need references. 4) In general, the sentences are redundant. Shorten the discussion.