

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 73815

Title: Why is endosonography insufficient for residual diagnosis after neoadjuvant therapy for esophageal cancer? Solutions using muscle layer evaluation

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05915662

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Chief Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-05 03:41

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-05 06:44

Review time: 3 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. As the author puts forward, the number of cases in this study is too small, resulting in insufficient reliability and rigor of the results. 2. Different from neoadjuvant chemotherapy, different changes (tissue fibrosis) after neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy will have different effects on endoscopic ultrasonography. Therefore, it is necessary to separate the above two. 3. The study is not sufficient to prove this conclusion.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 73815

Title: Why is endosonography insufficient for residual diagnosis after neoadjuvant therapy for esophageal cancer? Solutions using muscle layer evaluation

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05934641

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Associate Research Scientist, Senior Researcher, Senior Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-08 00:33

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-08 00:50

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

Re-review	[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

Thank you for the opportunity to review this article. According to the content of the article, I believe this is a diagnostic study. However, the sample size of this study is too small to produce any reliable results. In addition, the results of the study were not reported in accordance with general diagnostic research standards, such as Standards for Reporting of Diagnostic Accuracy (STARD).

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 73815

Title: Why is endosonography insufficient for residual diagnosis after neoadjuvant therapy for esophageal cancer? Solutions using muscle layer evaluation

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03026750

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FRCP, MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-06 07:15

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-10 07:40

Review time: 4 Days

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

Peer-reviewer statements	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

very important topic. However, retrospective design and small sample size make it difficult to come with solid conclusion. Also, i think radiotherpay may cause fibrosis more than chemotherapy alone.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 73815

Title: Why is endosonography insufficient for residual diagnosis after neoadjuvant therapy for esophageal cancer? Solutions using muscle layer evaluation

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03026750

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FRCP, MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-04

Reviewer chosen by: Yun-Xiaojuan Wu

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-04 18:34

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-04 18:43

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thanks for the authors review according to the previous comments. I think it can be accepted in the current form.