

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29900

**Title:** Critical analysis of feeding jejunostomy following resection of upper gastrointestinal malignancies

**Reviewer's code:** 01558248

**Reviewer's country:** Taiwan

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-09-01 17:44

**Date reviewed:** 2016-09-06 10:43

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Please add additional information will improve the value of this article. 1. Please tell us the data if the feeding jejunostomy being used as a preventive or not? 2. Check the anastomosis leak by x-ray study routinely? 3. Mortality appeared in Table 1 means operative mortality or due to feeding jejunostomy? 4. Word of "NS" do not need to be appeared in the Table 4.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29900

**Title:** Critical analysis of feeding jejunostomy following resection of upper gastrointestinal malignancies

**Reviewer's code:** 00112265

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-09-01 17:44

**Date reviewed:** 2016-10-09 16:39

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" 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 polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" 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 authors have performed a complete review about this interesting subject not very well known until now.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29900

**Title:** Critical analysis of feeding jejunostomy following resection of upper gastrointestinal malignancies

**Reviewer's code:** 02445522

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-09-01 17:44

**Date reviewed:** 2016-10-06 04:19

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper presents interesting insights, it is well structured and the comparison of results between the two types of intervention is well articulated