



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 90073

Title: Comparative efficacy and safety between endoscopic submucosal dissection, surgery and definitive chemoradiotherapy in patients with cT1N0M0 esophageal cancer

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 06090125

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Lecturer, Technical Editor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Iraq

Author’s Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-22

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-22 16:37

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-23 07:56

Review time: 15 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
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

Please read my comments/suggestions given below for preparing the revised draft: My Comments and Suggestions to Authors: 1- In my opinion, the abstract is too cumbersome and is hard to catch the key point. The keywords need to be more detailed. 2- In the Introduction part, the new features of the proposed method and the main advantages of the results over others should be clearly described. 3- An introduction should clearly highlight the motivation, problem statement, the objective of the paper, gap in the existing research and the novelty of the conducted research. 4- Manuscript needs a good introduction, the introduction section of the manuscript is weak, authors are advised to improvise the introduction section. 5- The contributions presented in this paper are not sufficient for possible publication in this journal. I highly suggest authors to clearly define the contributions. 6- The "Result and Discussion" section requires further attention and clarification, as it currently falls short in adequately explaining the research findings. Furthermore, it is essential to present the results in a clear and well-organized manner. This could involve using tables, graphs, or other visual aids to help convey complex information more easily. It may also be helpful to break down the



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: office@baishideng.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

results into smaller, more manageable sections. 7- The conclusions presented in this manuscript are lacking in depth and sophistication. I would recommend revising and expanding upon your conclusions to more effectively summarize and interpret the research findings.