



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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17539

Title: Peroral endoscopic myotomy for treatment of achalasia in geriatrics

Reviewer's code: 02544032

Reviewer's country: Norway

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-03-13 08:32

Date reviewed: 2015-03-20 14:21

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper presents outcome of POEM in 15 patients, 64-85 years, recorded with LES-pressure oesophageal diameter and QoL (SF 36) as endpoints. These data have general interest. However, the novelty value of the present form of the manuscript is limited, and might be increases. The following alterations is advised in manucript revision: 1. Complications to the POEM procedure should be described in greater detail: Really no perforation? If yes: How was followup during the first week after the procedure? (Routine CT...etc.) If perforations took Place - detailed description of clinical course/treatment interventions. 2. The discussion should deal more profoundly With the problem of remitting AC - what is the nest step? Would another intervention have been better from the beginning (for ex: laparoscopic myotomy?) 3. Minor: The term "geriatric" is inappropriate for this age interval - just give the range of age at inclusion, but avoid this term.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17539

Title: Peroral endoscopic myotomy for treatment of achalasia in geriatrics

Reviewer's code: 00068668

Reviewer's country: Mexico

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-03-13 08:32

Date reviewed: 2015-04-15 09:25

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper has a good information for clinical practice, however there are a few concerns mainly because the scarce information that the authors provides mainly in material and methods section (for ex. there is no a clear definition of "geriatric patients", complications, there is no information about how these patients were selected (I mean if they have others geriatric patients with achalasia, how decided which patients underwent circular myotomy alone while others had full-thickness myotomy. In statistical analysis the talk about mean, SD, student t test...all these statistics are not recommended for small size samples as in this paper, the authors needs to apply non-parametric measures.