BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 8908
Title: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy in Pregnancy
Reviewer code: 00071652
Science editor: Na Ma
Date sent for review: 2014-01-23 15:07
Date reviewed: 2014-01-24 18:14

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	BPG Search:	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] Existed	[Y] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This is well written review. However, you should share your experience and your studies.

BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 8908
Title: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy in Pregnancy
Reviewer code: 02451544
Science editor: Na Ma
Date sent for review: 2014-01-23 15:07
Date reviewed: 2014-03-01 23:07

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	BPG Search:	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] Existed	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
I agree with other reviewers said, you can provide some of your experience of this topic.In addition, the article language aspects need to be modified.For a few spelling mistakes, such as advers effcts, Metylene, terninal, elimineta, asistance ,you should revise these words . Some mistakes have been signed in the manuscript.

BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 8908
Title: Gastrointestinal Endoscopy in Pregnancy
Reviewer code: 00504669
Science editor: Na Ma
Date sent for review: 2014-01-23 15:07
Date reviewed: 2014-04-02 20:43

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] 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)	[Y] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Minor revision
[Y] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] Existed	[Y] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for asking me to review this interesting and comprehensive manuscript that addresses the important area of GI endoscopy in pregnancy. I will present my review as minor comments in lowercase and major comments in capitals. I did not receive a title page or abstract so I cannot comment on these. Furthermore, the manuscript is not double spaced, as is usual. THERE IS NO STATED STRUCTURE TO THE MANUSCRIPT – THE AUTHORS DO NOT GUIDE THE READER AS TO "WHAT TO EXPECT." NEEDS TO BE REVISED. There are numerous grammatical and spelling errors throughout the manuscript, which in my opinion make the manuscript unsuitable for publication in its current form. Consider abbreviating gastrointestinal to GI throughout the manuscript. The manuscript could be improved by presenting a balanced argument regarding each endoscopic intervention. Whilst the authors have tried to do this in their concluding paragraph, it would be nice to see this at the end of each section. PAGE 5 After Mobius syndrome the authors need to clarify that this is pathology related to the 6th and 7th cranial nerves. I would respectfully suggest that "mental retardation" is probably not appropriate current scientific or social parlance. PAGE 8 The first paragraph needs to be extensively revised it is not clear which, or the combination of which, hormones are influencing gastrointestinal motility. On the previous page the authors have stated that one of the most common indication for EGD is nausea and vomiting – please explain the discrepancy. The Debby study is poorly described – what proportion had nausea and vomiting – ie. What is the majority? PAGE 9 Fertility rates in liver disease needs to be referenced. What about the risk of beta-blockage during pregnancy PAGE 10 and onwards In the wider literature transjugular intrahepatic porto-systemic shunt in abbreviated as TIPSS. PAGE 12 Whilst PEG is

discussed as a method of enteral feeding, are there any studies regarding the endoscopic placement of NJ feeding tubes? PAGE 13 What do the authors mean when they discuss the efficacy of sigmoidoscopy? Are there any special considerations in pregnancy. They should discuss the possibilities, and attendant risks, of performing an underprepared (i.e. no pre-procedural cathartics) procedure.