



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3795

Title: Pseudoachalasia: report of a peculiar case and review of the literature

Reviewer code: 02462691

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-05-24 14:40

Date reviewed: 2013-05-27 04:04

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall comments There have been a number of reported series on pseudoachalasia already and therefore the current paper is not entirely novel unless the authors can attempt to improve the paper by working on their experience in the 11 patients and to work on the role of vascular compression. I am not sure that “peculiar” is right here or if it is indeed peculiar, the authors did not attempt to explain or discuss why it is peculiar. Specific comments Introduction - It is mentioned by the author that the case was peculiar but is it really? If it is, the authors did not attempt to explain this further or even discuss about it (see comments in discussion). Line 5: 100,000 rather than 100.000, line 11: Chagas disease rather than Chaga’s disease. Case report - How long did she experience symptoms and how much of weight loss? More details on manometric study should be given - equipment, technique, exact LES pressure etc - can high resolution manometry allow better characterization than conventional manometry which can be discussed. Signs of vascular compression on manometry, rather than just quoting the study, authors should report what they actually see eg exact value of elevated intraesophageal pressure at which levels. Better quality figures are needed. Line 1: 77 year old woman rather than 77-old Ambulatory series - It would be interesting to expand the characteristics of the 11 patients with pseudoachalasia rather than just listing in the table. This may include mode of diagnosis, clinical and investigation features which are similar or different from reported literatures and treatment response. Literature review - Line 10: amyloidosis rather than amyloidosis, line 20: underlying rather than underling Discussion - please quote reference for “Two patterns of tumor involvement have been described”. Rather just a general discussion of pseudoachalasia, authors should also discuss on their reported case especially on the role of vascular compression. It would be interesting to discuss on the characteristics of ambulatory series that compare with other reported literatures. References - Please check that referencing style should conform to journal’s format.



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3795

Title: Pseudoachalasia: report of a peculiar case and review of the literature

Reviewer code: 00253967

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-05-24 14:40

Date reviewed: 2013-05-31 13:10

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Nice case but proof-correction is necessary.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3795

Title: Pseudoachalasia: report of a peculiar case and review of the literature

Reviewer code: 00503535

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-05-24 14:40

Date reviewed: 2013-06-07 17:29

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript, the authors described pseudoachalasia, a secondary form of achalasia. The case was well presented and the literature review was well discussed. The reviewer considered that no serious problems were found, however, it contains some proposals as follows. 1. The reviewer considers that endoscopic findings are important: Please show some pictures. 2. Oesophageal manometric findings in the authors' 11 cases with pseudoachalasia should be presented. They might be very interesting. 3. In the CT view in Figure 2, the explanation should be written in English.