

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal EndoscopyManuscript NO: 87311Title: Endoscopic Ruler for varix size measurement: A multicenter pilot studyProvenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewedPeer-review model: Single blindReviewer's code: 02539765Position: Peer ReviewerAcademic degree: MBBS, MDProfessional title: Additional Professor, TeacherReviewer's Country/Territory: IndiaAuthor's Country/Territory: ChinaManuscript submission date: 2023-08-03Reviewer chosen by: AI TechniqueReviewer accepted review: 2023-08-03 04:55Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-10 12:55

**Review time:** 7 Days and 7 Hours

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	[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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



# Baishideng

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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ Y] 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	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study, the authors classified the varices with the aid of a unique endoscopic ruler and found that it performed better than the traditional approach. The main drawback of this study, notwithstanding some innovation, is the extremely small sample size, considering a multicenter study spanned over 1 year. The design of this study is largely cross-sectional, hence using the term "prospective" would be inappropriate. I'm afraid, but the work does not appear to be appropriate for a high impact publication in its current format. Perhaps the authors could think about improving the sample size and adding some follow-up data to make it more relevant.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy Manuscript NO: 87311 Title: Endoscopic Ruler for varix size measurement: A multicenter pilot study Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed Peer-review model: Single blind Reviewer's code: 02731847 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD, MSc Professional title: Associate Professor, Staff Physician Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil Author's Country/Territory: China Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-03 Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-11 01:00

**Review time:** 7 Days and 9 Hours

	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] 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	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair</li> <li>[ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation</li> </ul>



# Baishideng

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

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

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Noteworthy from a theoretical standpoint, however, the efficacy of this ruler in predicting bleeding risk needs more substantiation. The time it takes to use must be justified by improving relevant clinical outcomes. This innovative classification of varices using an endoscopic ruler is hindered by a small sample size, especially for a multicenter study spanning a year. The study's predominantly cross-sectional design calls into question the use of the term "prospective." To enhance its relevance, the authors might consider augmenting the sample size and introducing follow-up and clinical data.



## **RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT**

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy Manuscript NO: 87311 Title: Endoscopic Ruler for varix size measurement: A multicenter pilot study Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed Peer-review model: Single blind Reviewer's code: 02539765 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MBBS, MD Professional title: Additional Professor, Teacher Reviewer's Country/Territory: India Author's Country/Territory: China Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-03 Reviewer chosen by: Cong Lin Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-21 07:32

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-21 16:47

Review time: 9 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish	
Language quality	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>	
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>	
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No	



### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have no more critical comments. I believe standard of this manuscript is adequate for the selected journal.