

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 87047

Title: Endoscopic transgastric fenestration versus percutaneous drainage for management of (peri)pancreatic fluid collections adjacent to the gastric wall (with video)

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02845080

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DNB, FICS, FRCS (Gen Surg), MBBS, MMed, MNAMS, MS

Professional title: Associate Professor, Director, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Singapore

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-07-24

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu (Quit 2023)

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-27 13:15

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-27 14:12

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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

1. is the definition of clinical success your own or internationally agreed? any other definitions exist? 2. what is the size of PCD tubes. Were they retroperitoneal or intraperitoneal? 3. What is the size of nasocystic tube? Did you irrigate or lavage the nasocystic tube? 4. Any documentation of NG tube dislodgment? 5. How did you maintain nutrition with the ETGF? did u give TPN? Did the PCD pts got enteral nutrition? 6. How long do you give PPI prophylaxis? congrats on novel technique and nice video

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 87047

Title: Endoscopic transgastric fenestration versus percutaneous drainage for management of (peri)pancreatic fluid collections adjacent to the gastric wall (with video)

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03479389

Position: Associate Editor

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Director, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-07-24

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu (Quit 2023)

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-31 14:01

Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-01 21:54

Review time: 1 Day and 7 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
Novelty 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" 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

Please consider the number of days from the onset of acute pancreatitis to the procedure, excluding pre-intervention cases in both groups. Please indicate the number of cases requiring necrosectomy after each treatment. Please perform multivariate analysis of factors associated with clinical success.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 87047

Title: Endoscopic transgastric fenestration versus percutaneous drainage for management of (peri)pancreatic fluid collections adjacent to the gastric wall (with video)

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02951945

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-07-24

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-09-16 19:36

Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-16 22:40

Review time: 3 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting study and we congratulate authors for this interesting work. Endoscopic trans gastric fenestration as described in your study appears effective= 1) Please explain your selection criteria on how you decided PCD v/s ETGF 2) Why did you specifically select these patients for ETGF over EUS guided metal stent placement the results will be more meaningful if you have compared three groups- ETGF, EUS guided metal stent placement, PCD placement. I note your statement that metal stents are expensive and not widely available, but there are many series that reported metal stents in patients' cohorts from your region 3) Did these patients have similar techniques tried in other hospitals- in the sense if they were tried in other hospitals with PCD and you crossed them to ETGF or vice versa? 4) When you describe a relatively new technique in a case series, the inclusion and exclusion criteria need to be more defined- as why you chose PCD v/s ETGF and why you didn't opt for EUS guided metal stent placement 5) Do you have any estimate of total hospital visits, total interventions, total duration of hospital stay and cost effectiveness between two study groups?