

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 73737

Title: Reevaluation of the expanded indications in undifferentiated early gastric cancer for endoscopic submucosal dissection

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05381744

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-02

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-04 02:48

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-04 03:32

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	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

1. Please specify which version of the guidance is used for the current expanded criteria.
 2. Detailed clinical information of the 14 patients with LNM should include the total number of dissected lymph node.
 3. Please specify the criteria for inclusion of indicators in the multivariate analysis
 4. The author points out that mixed histology (tumors consisting of 10–90% of signet ring cells) had a marginally significant association ($P = 0.059$) with the risk of LNM. Can the proportion of signet ring cells be divided in more detail, such as 10-50%, 50-90%, >90% ?
 5. The number of patients with LNM in only 14, and he conclusions of this paper need to be verified by larger sample data.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 73737

Title: Reevaluation of the expanded indications in undifferentiated early gastric cancer for endoscopic submucosal dissection

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05527205

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-02

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-02 16:15

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-02 16:43

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author present an evaluation of ESD in EGC-UD, it is quite interesting that they find EGC-UD may have relatively higher LNM rate, which may lead to poor prognosis due to the flaws of ESD. This article is well-organized, and of great importance. However, the author needs to solve some problomes, here is may concerns: 1) Only 14 patients with LNM were used in this evaluation, more patients is needed. 2) Indepent cohorts are needed for confiming the findings. 3) Why choose 1:4 ratio? 4) Besides Blurring of MM, there are some markers for doctors to identify EGC-UD with potential LNM in ESD process?

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 73737

Title: Reevaluation of the expanded indications in undifferentiated early gastric cancer for endoscopic submucosal dissection

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05527205

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-02

Reviewer chosen by: Han Zhang (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-02-13 14:13

Reviewer performed review: 2022-02-14 05:55

Review time: 15 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author insist that 14 patients are sufficient to identify markers for EGC-UD, which is not credible for clinical practice. Furthermore, I can not find the figures and tables of the article. Here is several concerns: 1) Besides of histology and clinical variables, there are any biomarkers for LNM identification of EGC-UD? 2) Since all patients with LNM have signet ring cells, why the p-value is noly marginal significant, what is the detail information of matched cases? 3) Since the small sample size, the author needs to perform permutaion analysis by replacing the matched cases to draw reliable conclusion.