

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18157

Title: Data analyses and perspectives on laparoscopic surgery for esophageal achalasia

Reviewer's code: 02444931

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2015-04-09 21:39

Date reviewed: 2015-04-23 09:21

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

1.The logicity of paragraph "open surgery" should be reinforced. The conclusion of this paragraph seems not to be evidential. 2.The comparsion of long-term outcomes between open method and minimally invasive surgery are not described definitely. If you want to emphasize the long term outcome, more concrete description should be covered, such as complication and QOL. 3.The robotic approach is novel, but are not essential. 4.Argument like "Some patients developed esophageal squamous cell carcinoma during the long follow-up after successful relief of esophageal obstruction by surgery" is recognized to be very uncertain. Maybe you should delete it or change your expression. 5.The language should be furhter polished. On one hand, there exist some ambiguous reference of pronouns just like "the therapy" in the last sentence of the abstract, "the procedure" in the line 10 of the paragraph "open surgery", "they" in the line 11 of the paragraph "the thoracoscopic surgery vs. laparoscopic surgery". On the other hand, the arguments you propose should be consistent with your viewpoint and irrelevant argument should be deleted, just like "the operating time was significantly longer in the laparoscopic surgery group than that in the other group (178 minutes vs. 125 minutes) but there was not much difference in the therapeutic effect, mortality, and morbidity." in page 6.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18157

Title: Data analyses and perspectives on laparoscopic surgery for esophageal achalasia

Reviewer's code: 01047575

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2015-04-09 21:39

Date reviewed: 2015-04-27 21:32

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"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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

1. Abstract The abstract can not summarize the content of this review well. The information of laparoscopic surgery should be emphasized. 2. Some part of the manuscript is not complete. Such as "but 11 of the 18 articles on surgical treatment of esophageal achalasia reported combination of myotomy with laparoscopic antireflux surgery (LARS)" (Page 4). How about the results of combination of myotomy with LARS? There is no data or explanation. 3. Is there shortcoming about minimally invasive surgery? Please clarify. 4. The article listed the results of many studies, but did not analyze the problems or drawbacks of these studies.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18157

Title: Data analyses and perspectives on laparoscopic surgery for esophageal achalasia

Reviewer's code: 01804189

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2015-04-09 21:39

Date reviewed: 2015-04-24 01:53

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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"/> [Y] 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 type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a well written review on various methods of treatment of achalasia cardia. It would be better if the authors can provide guidelines for treatment based on age of the patient, manometric findings, fitness for surgery, etc.