

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12121

Title: Successful treatment of life-threatening bleeding from a duodenal posterior bulb peptic ulcer by an over-the-scope-clip

Reviewer code: 00503623

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-06-24 13:35

Date reviewed: 2014-06-26 22:11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" 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"/> Existing	<input checked="" 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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This report illustrates the successful use of OTSC in the treatment of bleeding peptic ulcer. While the procedure is well documented, the narrative part of the text suffers considerably due to poor composition, word duplication, and grammar. Examples are, line 4 under Abstract, "duodenal wall use of " should read "duodenal wall using an ..". Last line on p.2. repeated twice "showed". Other examples; usage of "spurtering, sputerring, and splunting" Well, which word is right? Hence, kindly please go over the text and correct these omissions.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12121

Title: Successful treatment of life-threatening bleeding from a duodenal posterior bulb peptic ulcer by an over-the-scope-clip

Reviewer code: 02823521

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-06-24 13:35

Date reviewed: 2014-06-30 23:49

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you very much for the opportunity to review this manuscript. In summary, this paper represents a nice case report with few reasons for criticism. Nevertheless, I am sorry to argue, that this manuscript is not suitable for publication in WJG due to the inadequate interest to readers.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12121

Title: Successful treatment of life-threatening bleeding from a duodenal posterior bulb peptic ulcer by an over-the-scope-clip

Reviewer code: 00504545

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-06-24 13:35

Date reviewed: 2014-07-20 23:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the title of this paper you must write "over the scope clip" instead of OTSC When you comment about red blood cell count you must change by the hemoglobin levels expressed in g/dl.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12121

Title: Successful treatment of life-threatening bleeding from a duodenal posterior bulb peptic ulcer by an over-the-scope-clip

Reviewer code: 00036517

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-06-24 13:35

Date reviewed: 2014-07-27 11:34

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> 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		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major points 1. Authors wrote that the patient did not take any medication. But I suggest that authors need to add and/or check that the patient did not take any NSAIDs. 2. The discussion was too limited. I suggest that authors need to explain about OTSC more clearly, and need to include the downside of using OTSC through endoscopy. 3. Authors need to add whether the patient was infected with H. pylori or not. Minor points 1. On page 3, line 1, the word "showed" was written twice. 2. On page 3, last line, the letter before the USA was an unreadable character. (this could be a software compatibility problem) 3. RBC should be written as 5.3, NOT 5,3