

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 53970

**Title:** The preliminary experience of hybrid endoscopic submucosal dissection technique by duodenoscope for the recurrent laterally spreading lesions of the papilla

**Reviewer's code:** 03479326

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Chief Physician, Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-06-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-06-19 11:29

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-07-05 23:55

**Review time:** 16 Days and 12 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The authors reported on two cases of hybrid ESD for remnant LST lesions of duodenal papilla. This procedure using duodenoscopy is challenging and very interesting. Here I have some questions. 1. In Table 1, it is noted that both lesions were completely resected at the time of initial treatment. This means that the horizontal and vertical margins of the specimen were histologically negative. Generally thinking, recurrence means that they were not completely resected, but why they recurred in spite of the complete resection? 2. In both lesions, they were evaluated as "clear border", but how was the histological margins? Were they negative? It is not specified in the manuscript nor table. 3. In Figure 2, it is stated that the tumor was dissected by ESD, but was it not a hybrid ESD? 4. In Discussion, it is described that IDUS was performed for the assessment of intraductal growth, however, there was no description about the details of IDUS in the Method and Result. 5. "Intrductal" in line 218 and "would" in line 238 are misspelled.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 53970

**Title:** The preliminary experience of hybrid endoscopic submucosal dissection technique by duodenoscope for the recurrent laterally spreading lesions of the papilla

**Reviewer's code:** 00056943

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** FEBS, MD, MSc

**Professional title:** Chairman, Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Österreich

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-06-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-07-06 08:19

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-07-12 20:44

**Review time:** 6 Days and 12 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Dear Sir, I read with interest the manuscript entitled "The preliminary experience of hybrid endoscopic submucosal dissection technique by duodenoscope for the recurrent laterally spreading lesions of the papilla" The manuscript is well designed and written. The introduction gives a good overview about the topic and the procedures are precisely described. However, some issues have to be addressed: 1. If the procedures and the postinterventional course were completely uneventful, why did the patients stay more than 10 days? What about the postinterventional lab tests? This should be mentioned in the Results section 2. The discussion section is very general and should discuss the results of this present study more precisely. 3. and main issue: The number of performed procedures is very low. The present study is presented as prospective study. In my opinion this is a technical study or an extended case report. How many patients have been excluded within the last years? and why? Only because they refused this treatment, or have you had other reasons?

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 53970

**Title:** Preliminary experience of hybrid endoscopic submucosal dissection by duodenoscope for recurrent laterally spreading papillary lesions

**Reviewer's code:** 03479326

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Chief Physician, Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-06-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ji-Hong Liu (Technical Editor)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-08-12 06:46

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-08-12 11:43

**Review time:** 4 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript has been improved well.