

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 84523

Title: Is endoscopic mucosal resection-precutting superior to conventional methods for removing sessile colorectal polyps?

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02573214

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Full Professor, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-21

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-06 04:33

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-23 00:34

Review time: 16 Days and 20 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish	
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection 	
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection 	
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No	



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The letter contains valid topics that can be discussed. The manuscript can be considered for publication.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 84523

Title: Is endoscopic mucosal resection-precutting superior to conventional methods for removing sessile colorectal polyps?

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04071697

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Academic Research

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-21

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-09 03:20

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-09 03:28

Review time: 1 Hour

	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	 [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation
	-



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Reasonable questions over a published study