



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 82894

Title: Paediatric gastrointestinal endoscopy in the Asian-Pacific region: Recent advances in diagnostic and therapeutic techniques

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05382551

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: Singapore

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-19 08:41

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-19 09:20

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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

The article is within the scope of the journal and deals with an interesting topic. It is well written. reading is fluent The content is original and the results represent an advance in the area of knowledge. Several experimental cases are described. Some article improvements: a) Organize the article according to the standard structure: Introduction, Materials, Methods, Results, Discussion and Conclusions. b) A discussion section is especially important where the work presented is compared with other similar works, exposing its advances and limitations. c) The conclusions should highlight the scientific contribution of the article. d) The description of the state of the art should be improved



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 82894

Title: Paediatric gastrointestinal endoscopy in the Asian-Pacific region: Recent advances in diagnostic and therapeutic techniques

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06491147

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Guatemala

Author's Country/Territory: Singapore

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-20 19:04

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-26 05:15

Review time: 5 Days and 10 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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

I have attached my comments to the authors based on the verification criteria list in that order: 1. The title reflects the main theme of the manuscript, although “future directions” is a part that was not delved into so much that it is mentioned in the title 2. The abstract summarizes the first part of the manuscript quite well, however it does not summarize the advances in diagnostic and therapeutic endoscopy that are included in the review. I see the abstract as a statement of the problem that motivated the preparation of the paper rather than as a summary of the content. The summary exposes more than necessary the problem of H. pylori infection and the usefulness of endoscopy in it. 3. Keywords do reflect the focus of the manuscript 4. The manuscript describes very well the background, current status and importance of the review 5. Does not apply 6. The review does achieve the objective of presenting the current situation of pediatric endoscopy in the region and this contributes to continue writing about it. 7. The scientific importance of the paper and their clinical relevance are mentioned and sufficiently discussed 8. Ok 9. DOes not apply 10. ok 11. ok 12. It is well organized. The Word “scarce or scarcely” is mentiones multiple times. In some of these



**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

times (when possible due to the context) this could be replaced by “low”. At the beginning of the last big paragraph before the conclusions section it seems to me that there is typing error, I paste it here: “ Scientific societies recommended different competence threshold for lower and lauupper GI endoscopies. NASPGHAN,” 13. Does not apply 14. Does not apply Writing comments according to the three proposed criteria First: ---- Second: It is a paper with relevant information which proposes some new concepts such as “positive diagnostic yield” Third: This publication carries out and adequate and quite complete review of the current status of pediatric endoscopy in the region, providing precise numerical and statistical data and reflecting the need to reach consensus.