



ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15042

Title: Endoscopic and biopsy diagnoses of superficial, nonampullary, duodenal epithelial tumors

Reviewer code: 00724436

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-11-06 15:54

Date reviewed: 2014-11-18 23:38

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

To the authors The study is well written and the English of the manuscript is very good. The data is well presented and the tables and figures are satisfying. The number of patients with duodenal carcinomas is significant. However, the following points need to be addressed: - The histology of the duodenal lesions shows a selection bias toward duodenal carcinoma, possibly due to the fact that most patients fro ; this study actually underwent surgical resection. Therefore, it is not likely that this study is representative for NADETs. The study is rather conceived to report the diagnostic performances of high definition endoscopy and endoscopic biopsies for the diagnosis of non ampullary duodenal carcinomas. The authors should rephrase their title in accordance to the findings they report (eg= Endoscopic and biopsy diagnoses of superficial, nonampullary, duodenal adenocarcinoma). - The study was obviously conducted in an expert center: this bias, explaining the high diagnostic performances of endoscopic diagnosis, should be mentionned in the discussion. - The auhors might explain why they did not use a duodenoscope or an enteroscope for some of the lesions. - The number of biopsies performed should be mentioned, since this factor changes the sensitivity of the preoperative histology. - The authors should present the results of a multivariate analysis, or explain why they did not do so.