

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 47994

**Title:** Endoscopic vacuum assisted closure of esophagogastric anastomosis dehiscence:  
A case report

**Reviewer's code:** 03251421

**Position:** Editor-in-Chief

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Author's country:** Poland

**Reviewer chosen by:** Fang-Fang Ji (Quit in 2019)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-05-10 04:40

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-05-13 07:14

**Review time:** 3 Days and 2 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thanks for your work in the preparation of this manuscript, I have several questions and suggestions before final decision. 1. What is the main difference with previous studies, since many cases using E-VAC have been reported? 2. Can you add the figures showing the leakages before application of E-VAC? You may also include radiologic imaging revealing no leakage after healing of the wound. 3. Figure 3 is not consistent with the content of the manuscript. Please put it in correct place. 4. In the first case, you said that "The surgical treatment was combined in the patient with parenteral nutrition." What do you mean? You perform E-VAC for this patient, and prescribe parenteral nutrition for him during the whole course? 5. For the second patients, E-VAC was changed three times every third day, so the whole duration of E-VAC was 9 days or not. Besides, the patient improved in 3 weeks. What is your criteria of removing the E-VAC? Can you clearly clarify this? I am kind of confused.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☒ No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☒ No