

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22730

Title: Condyloma acuminatum of the anal canal, treated with endoscopic submucosal dissection

Reviewer's code: 01799429

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2015-09-19 11:53

Date reviewed: 2015-10-05 16:30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input 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 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"/> 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 was interesting case report of CA of the anal canal. Both diagnosis and treatment were well organized, and prognosis of patient seemed good. I have only two suggestions for this article. 1. I supposed that "surveillance" colonoscopy was not adequate in this situation. "Diagnostic colonoscopy" or only "colonoscopy" was better. 2. Please described social history or lifestyle of patient.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22730

Title: Condyloma acuminatum of the anal canal, treated with endoscopic submucosal dissection

Reviewer's code: 00502797

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2015-09-19 11:53

Date reviewed: 2015-10-07 00:44

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" 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 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

Points of criticism: 1. The authors performed an endoscopic mucosal dissection for the treatment of Condyloma acuminatum whereas other two cases have been reported in the same country (Japan). 2. The follow up period (sixteen months) is too short to form safe conclusion regarding the long-term results of this method. 3. More cases are needed as well as a randomized controlled study in order to comment on the new method.