

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 17588

**Title:** TRANSANAL ENDOSCOPIC SURGERY: INDICATIONS, TECHNICAL OPTIONS AND OUTCOMES.

**Reviewer's code:** 00182276

**Reviewer's country:** Hungary

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2015-03-16 14:13

**Date reviewed:** 2015-03-17 16:46

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input 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 aim of this review to introduce the novel techniques and applicability of Transanal TEM. The article detailed the indications and contraindications and opened new questions of further usage as well. I think this is a valuable paper to overthink again the oncological treatment triages as well.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 17588

**Title:** TRANSANAL ENDOSCOPIC SURGERY: INDICATIONS, TECHNICAL OPTIONS AND OUTCOMES.

**Reviewer's code:** 02548901

**Reviewer's country:** Ireland

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2015-03-16 14:13

**Date reviewed:** 2015-04-09 19:21

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review is on an interesting and worthwhile topic. However, it is very lengthy, unstructured and attempts to cover too much. As such, it losses the reader midway through the article. The authors should attempt to reduce its length by half to a third, at least, and drop less critical elements. For example, the section on 'follow up' seems out of place and the section on cancer rambles on indefinitely. There is nearly a whole page on emr vs esd- again.. Too long! The article also seems somewhat dated . TaTME is the current hot topic in TAMIS technology and it is hardly mentioned at all. Newer anatomical descriptions relating to this area eg by Coffey et al could also be incorporated. Introduction could certainly be stronger. More minor comments: 'advanced' cancers can be treated by taTME ( technically speaking) so I would omit statements that these can only be treated palliatively by TES Omit the reference-less and non specific statement; 'tumour bx has a low accuracy' The authors use of English is a little strange at times. I would omit the term 'diffusion' ( used several times) and 'implantation' on p14. Several 'facts' are not referenced.. Eg '400 centres offer this technique' I found the 'practical tips' on p9 interesting and worth keeping in the article.