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: 13964
Title: Endoscopic features of early-stage signet-ring-cell carcinoma of the stomach
Reviewer's code: 00045716
Reviewer's country: Japan
Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong
Date sent for review: 2014-09-11 09:22
Date reviewed: 2014-11-02 22:18

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[Y] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[Y] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

There are good points in the manuscript; for example Fig. 3 is very beautifully illustrated. However there are some weak points and unclear descriptions. Point-by-point comments and questions; 1. Clarify in what institute(s) the patients were observed and treated; in Siriraj Hospital, Koto-Toyosu Hospital, or was the study done as a multicenter project? 2. Were the pictures of Figure 1 and 2a taken from the same patient? If not, the magnification power in Figure 1c is not enough. 3. Concerning Figure 1d, the microscopic view; Show a picture of the resected specimen together with the lines of pathological cross section, and demonstrate which part of the lesion Figure 1d represents. In addition the magnification power of Figure 1d is not enough to identify signet ring cells. 4. Although the authors repeatedly maintained that the "stretch sign" is useful for the diagnosis of signet-ring-cell carcinoma, but you should describe the finding more in detail. For example I do not quite understand what are the differences between the signet-ring-cell carcinoma and non-signet-ring-cell carcinoma in Figure 2. Describe the differences more in detail. I do not know if Figure 1d was taken from the same patient as Figure 2a, but I think the authors wanted to say that the NBI image of Figure 1d represents the pathological structure of signet-ring-cell carcinoma. I

advise the authors to show also the microscopic view of non-signet-ring-cell carcinoma in Figure 2b for the comparison and better understanding. 5. Is the “stretch sign” observed in the entire surface of the lesion, or is it identified only in a small portion of the lesion? 6. Figure 3 is very beautifully illustrated, but you should clarify that it is only an imaginary and speculative view concerning the development of signet-ring-cell carcinoma. What does the signature “Kimmy” stand for in Figure 1d and 3? Is he (or she) a pathologist or professional illustrator? Is he (or she) included in the authors? 7. The title had better be changed to "Endoscopic features of early-stage signet-ring-cell carcinoma of the stomach"

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: 13964
Title: Endoscopic features of early-stage signet-ring-cell carcinoma of the stomach
Reviewer's code: 00159291
Reviewer's country: United States
Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong
Date sent for review: 2014-09-11 09:22
Date reviewed: 2014-10-27 18:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper needs minimal corrections in terms of editing, few places were there is no space between point and new word. Please clarify what would be the more aggressive treatment which you mention at the end of Discussion.