

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

**Manuscript NO:** 85612

**Title:** Outpatient hybrid endoscopic submucosal dissection with SOUTEN for early gastric cancer, followed by endoscopic suturing of the mucosal defect

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03585867

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Chairman, Chief Doctor, Chief Physician, Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-05-12 02:01

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-05-21 05:46

**Review time:** 9 Days and 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<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>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

Hybrid ESD using a multifunctional snare (SOUTEN) has been reported to be effective for colorectal lesions, while this case report is the first to complement this technology in the treatment of outpatients with early gastric cancer, which slows the way for the validation of the generalizability of this technique in clinical applications. However, there is a minor inappropriate expression during the part of conclusion. “ Outpatient hybrid ESD.... is safe and useful.” As my opinion, it’s not very accurate because “safe and useful” is only confirmed in this one case, some revise need to be added.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

**Manuscript NO:** 85612

**Title:** Outpatient hybrid endoscopic submucosal dissection with SOUTEN for early gastric cancer, followed by endoscopic suturing of the mucosal defect

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 01220065

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Academic Research, Additional Professor, Attending Doctor, Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-05-29 12:14

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-05-31 13:09

**Review time:** 2 Days

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<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

Renma Ito et al presented an interesting case of early gastric cancer treated by hybrid endoscopic submucosal dissection with SOUTEN followed by endoscopic suturing of the mucosal defect. The patient was old and the treatment was successful. The paper was clear and informative. I have only one comment for the paper: it would be more perfect that if the authors could discuss more about the advances and disadvantages of such treatment in gastric cancer and compare the differences of such treatment in gastric and colorectal cancer.