

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 3588

**Title:** Grasper Type Scissors for Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection of Gastric Epithelial Neoplasia

**Reviewer code:** 02446805

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

**Date sent for review:** 2013-05-08 13:43

**Date reviewed:** 2013-05-10 03:00

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Ms: ESPS Manuscript No.3588 Comments on “Grasper Type Scissors for Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection of Gastric Epithelial Neoplasia” are as below: The authors developed a novel device, grasper type of scissors (GTS), for endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD) of gastric neoplasia. This device was modified from grasping type scissors forceps (GFS), which Akahoshi K previously reported. In this study, GTS resolved several disadvantage of GFS and clearly succeeded to reduce the cost of ESD. This study is very interesting, exciting and useful for all endoscopists. In addition, many studies cited by authors were well reviewed and well discussed. Especially, this study is also very precious because I believe it is the first report described about this device. Thus, it will be a hot topic in ESD treatment. Taken together, this report should be published in “World Journal of Gastroenterology”. However, there are some following specific points, which should be added before acceptance (Minor Revision). 1. In “Discussion”, authors described very well about advantage of GTS and disadvantage of GFS. However, how the author groups developed GTS from GFS. Modification process should be described more detail in “Introduction” or “Discussion”. For example, did “Fujinon” or any other companies helped this project about development of this device? If so, how did they modify GTS from GFS? 2. A scheme of GTS procedure should be added as another figure as Akahoshi (in author’s citations) previously showed in his paper. It should be easier to understand this technique for all readers. 3. Can authors add “Differentiation of adenocarcinoma (well-, moderate-, or poor-differentiated)” and “Local recurrence rate of adenocarcinoma in each differentiation” as comparison parameters in Table 1? Confidential comments: This study is very interesting, exciting, novel and clearly worthy to be published in “World Journal of Gastroenterology” with highest priority. Acceptance after modifications is recommended (Minor Revision).



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

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

---

(Additional evaluation) Classification of the manuscript: Grade A Language evaluation: Grade A

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 3588

**Title:** Grasper Type Scissors for Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection of Gastric Epithelial Neoplasia

**Reviewer code:** 00503857

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

**Date sent for review:** 2013-05-08 13:43

**Date reviewed:** 2013-05-26 21:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors conducted a prospective randomized study to evaluate a newly modified ESD knife, which was modified from grasping type scissors forceps. Results of this study showed that this newly modified knife was as effective as hook knife + coagrasper with regard to the outcome of complete resection rate. However, I have several minor concerns to this study. 1. In Material and Methods section, there is no need to show the formula of calculating sample size calculation. You have made it clear in the text. 2. You should describe the limitation of the study design. Complete resection rate was selected as the primary outcome of your study design, thus leading to the sample size estimation. However, as you have stated in the text, this modified knife can facilitate the dissection of submucosal layer because the tip of the knife is not insulated. Long term study and larger sample size may show the benefit of this modified knife: shorter procedure time and similar complication rate. 3.

You had better add a figure showing grasping type scissors forcep and the modified knife in the same figure.