

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25939

**Title:** Surgical palliation of gastric outlet obstruction in advanced malignancy

**Reviewer's code:** 02534438

**Reviewer's country:** Croatia

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-26 22:10

**Date reviewed:** 2016-03-31 15:50

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The overall structure of the manuscript is complete. Scientific question is well placed and answered. Authors adequately understand and cite all of the important references in to support the overall explanation of the study and its findings. Authors provide adequate analysis and comprehensive discussion on the basis of the current literature. Conclusions are clearly presented in the Conclusion section. Manuscript cites all important, relevant and timely references. There is no indication of academic misconduct in the manuscript. Manuscript describes important methods and problems in directions of research. The title of the manuscript contains key words, and is interesting enough to attract readers' attention. The topic of the manuscript falls within the scope of World Journal of Gastroenterology. The language of the manuscript reaches the standard of publishing.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25939

**Title:** Surgical palliation of gastric outlet obstruction in advanced malignancy

**Reviewer's code:** 03035769

**Reviewer's country:** France

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-26 22:10

**Date reviewed:** 2016-04-02 15:54

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for asking me to review this manuscript on tips and tricks for lap gastric bypass. ? The article addresses an important entity and many newly qualified surgeons may find this article interesting , but: ? It includes too many grammatical errors. ? This study is limited by its retrospective analysis Nothing new in this manuscript. Also please detail how the changes impacted on your outcomes? Why not compare the study findings with some relevant studies which have similar objectives as yours. Table?figure?

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25939

**Title:** Surgical palliation of gastric outlet obstruction in advanced malignancy

**Reviewer's code:** 03479590

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-26 22:10

**Date reviewed:** 2016-04-03 07:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The operative descriptions are excellent and I thought the subsequent outcome section also beneficial. The beginning aspect of the article is too long regarding palliative care and patient selection for palliative care. This section needs to be shortened.