

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22018

**Title:** Clinical features, endoscopic polypectomy and STK11 gene mutation in a nine-month-old PJS Chinese infant

**Reviewer's code:** 00503255

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2015-08-11 14:29

**Date reviewed:** 2015-10-06 09:30

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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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 authors described a Peutz-Jeghers syndrome (PJS) infant with STK 11 gene mutation who developed intestinal perforation following endoscopic polypectomy. Abstract 1. page 2, line 13: What is the first? PJS in Chinese infant? Detailed report of an infant with PJS? A PJS infant with STK 11 gene mutation? Introduction 2. page3, line 6: What is the first? Methods 3. page 3, line 12 and 17: Please delete these dates in the case presentation. Systematic literature concerning pediatric PJS 4. What data base did you search for? 5. You provided a table 1 only without any explanation. You should analyze the data of literature review in table 1 and explain them. Discussion 6. In Table 1, two infants with PJS underwent endoscopic polypectomy. One of them died and other (patient in this report) was suffered from intestinal perforation and septic shock following endoscopic polypectomy. In addition, the patient in this report had large polyps. The authors described that "polyp size, its pedunculated or sessile nature, its location, the age of the child, and the experience of the endoscopist are important factors when selecting between endoscopic or surgical removal of a large polyp". Although there are few case reports of infants with PJS, it seems likely that operation is safer than



## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

endoscopic polypectomy for infants with PJS. Why did you select endoscopic polypectomy for this patient?      References 7. A style of reference you used is somewhat difference from the instruction to the authors of this journal. Journal title should be in its abbreviated form as shown in PubMed, followed by the article publication information, including the publication year, volume number, and start page through end page. The PMID and DOI will follow this information and be written as [PMID: DOI: ].



# 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:** 22018

**Title:** Clinical features, endoscopic polypectomy and STK11 gene mutation in a nine-month-old PJS Chinese infant

**Reviewer's code:** 00158184

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2015-08-11 14:29

**Date reviewed:** 2015-10-08 04:18

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

the subject was discussed very well