

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14866

**Title:** Recent advancement of therapeutic endoscopy in the esophageal benign disease

**Reviewer's code:** 02581987

**Reviewer's country:** Belgium

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-02 11:17

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-11 17:37

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a really interesting paper on hot topics. I have only a few comments. Is the paper title the right one? Is the word benign necessary? The first paragraph is the less convincing. The background is not in compliance with the rest of the text, the real aim of this paragraph is ARMS. Last paragraph: stents, I would add comments on pediatric studies and stents (Bambino Jesu hospital experience)

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14866

**Title:** Recent advancement of therapeutic endoscopy in the esophageal benign disease

**Reviewer's code:** 01446071

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-02 11:17

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-14 04:55

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a review article concerning recent advancement of therapeutic endoscopy in esophageal benign diseases. The paper is very well written and covers in depth all recent issues dealing with advanced endoscopic techniques. However, I have some comments to make: 1. In page 2, line 8, the sentence "There is evidence....improvement in GERD symptoms" is not well written. I would change it as follows: "There is evidence that at least in short and mid-term both subjective and objective improvement in GERD has been noted". 2. In page 2, line 16, antir-eflux should be corrected to antireflux. 3. In page 2, line 31, I would add the word "both" : ... showing excellent results both subjectively and objectively (32). 4. In page 2, line 37, I would change the sentence as follows: "The ARMS procedure can be performed with ESD or EMR... 5. In page 11, line 36, "are reported" should be replaced by "is reported". 6. In page 11, line 39, "select patients" should be replaced by "selected patients". 7. References are not written properly concerning journals abbreviations.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14866

**Title:** Recent advancement of therapeutic endoscopy in the esophageal benign disease

**Reviewer's code:** 00069066

**Reviewer's country:** Indonesia

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-02 11:17

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-15 07:37

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed 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		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is the good review of advanced therapeutic endoscopic technique for esophageal disease. I think, it will be good reference for others gastroenterologist who want to perform this techniques. Actually this review evaluate the ARMS, over the scope clips (OTSC), POEM, POET and esophageal stenting so you have better always to write this techniques sequentially in abstract and summary. It is good if you want to inform us about how to be skilled operators to perform this novel technique. Need some corrections for mistyped and references writing.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14866

**Title:** Recent advancement of therapeutic endoscopy in the esophageal benign disease

**Reviewer's code:** 02549363

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-02 11:17

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-06 20:04

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Suggest change title to 'recent advances in therapeutic endoscopy in the esophageal benign diseases  
Suggest re-write under clear disease category or technique. Currently it seems to be mix of both. It will also be useful if each condition / technique is discussed under the same / similar subheadings and adding Series reporting for each of the techniques

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14866

**Title:** Recent advancement of therapeutic endoscopy in the esophageal benign disease

**Reviewer's code:** 02941580

**Reviewer's country:** South Korea

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-02 11:17

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-29 08:43

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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

This review article is dealing with important issue and well-written and well summarized the topic. I strongly recommend this article for high priority for publication.