

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17068

Title: Endoscopic treatment for small gastric subepithelial tumors originating from the muscularis propria layer

Reviewer's code: 00182860

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-02-11 15:03

Date reviewed: 2015-02-23 00:48

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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"/> 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 is an excellent paper. I only suggest to better delucidate the relationship between the different techniques and tumor dimensions, if any exist .

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17068

Title: Endoscopic treatment for small gastric subepithelial tumors originating from the muscularis propria layer

Reviewer's code: 00068458

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-02-11 15:03

Date reviewed: 2015-02-23 09:11

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input 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 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 authors have reviewed good studies for "Endoscopic treatment for small gastric subepithelial tumors originating from the muscularis propria layer" and have submitted a well-written manuscript. I have just minor comments; 1. Traditionally, the treatment of choice for GIST is surgical resection. However, the tyrosine kinase inhibitor imatinib has become an important additional management tool. Please discuss briefly treatment strategy for better clinical decision-making. 2. In the "Summary" section, please summarize the endoscopic operation procedures briefly.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17068

Title: Endoscopic treatment for small gastric subepithelial tumors originating from the muscularis propria layer

Reviewer's code: 00050849

Reviewer's country: Sweden

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-02-11 15:03

Date reviewed: 2015-02-23 11:36

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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 present paper by Yu Zhang et al. is a review on endoscopic treatment of gastric SETs originating from MP. I suggest that the authors include tables with the pros and cons of every technique and the possible clinical scenario that every one of them should be elected. It has to be analyzed in the text why a high risk endoscopic removal is superior to surgical removal. The relevant table with comparison of possible complications could be added.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17068

Title: Endoscopic treatment for small gastric subepithelial tumors originating from the muscularis propria layer

Reviewer's code: 01047630

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-02-11 15:03

Date reviewed: 2015-02-14 17:45

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 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 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a review article for SETs originating from the MP layer. The authors deal with recently advanced procedures. However, there are several issues to be considered. (1) There are no suggested indications for each technique. For example, in the case of STER, the preferred sites are cardia and antrum. And the upper size limit is usually less than 4 cm. Therefore, the indications for each technique (if it is difficult, the general indication for ER) should be added. (2) It is thought that ESD is nearly same to EME. Of course, although the authors suggested some difference between them, the real procedure is nearly same. Therefore, it is recommended that EME will included in the section of ESD. (3) The last paragraph in ESD is not described properly. Please revise it. (4) As possible, please make a Table explaining pros and cons of each procedure. (5) Other trivial things are marked in the attached file. Please revise them.