



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 18189

Title: Diagnosis of small intramucosal signet ring cell carcinoma of the stomach by non-magnifying narrow-band imaging: A pilot study

Reviewer's code: 00182274

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-04-12 00:14

Date reviewed: 2015-05-26 18:03

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Good paper



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 18189

Title: Diagnosis of small intramucosal signet ring cell carcinoma of the stomach by non-magnifying narrow-band imaging: A pilot study

Reviewer's code: 00004678

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-04-12 00:14

Date reviewed: 2015-04-12 14:16

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Indeed , I have Been Waiting Long Till somebody comes up with the endoscopic (minute) criteria of the appearance of early Signet Ring cell carcinoma. And I am Not surprised that such a Manuscript comes from Japanese authors. In fact, i have only three very Minor comments. Figures 1C and 3E: it is really hard to See the cancer on H&E. The authors may Want to add Or replace the pics by a pancytokeratin Stain to make IT more easy for the inexperienced Reader to Identity. Personally, i would prefer to add a pancytokeratin. Prognosis of ADVANCED Signet Ring cell carcinoma: i Share the authors view that early srcc has a better prognosis than other Types. I think with Advanced srcc the prognosis is Worth. The Cunningham et al Study Showed this nicely. The reason is probably to be Seen in the higher rate of peritoneal Spread. The authors may Want to Cite the Cunningham Follow up Study as well But still mention that some other authors See IT more controversial