

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25970

**Title:** Endoscopic submucosal dissection of gastric tumors: A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 02455208

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-27 17:58

**Date reviewed:** 2016-03-29 21:32

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google 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"/> 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		<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

ESD is the natural evolution of endoscopy and a few will doubt its potential. Not surprisingly, Asia dominates this field. The article is very interesting and well written. English is at a level of native speaker. It is also properly constructed, having followed the principles of meta-analyses. The number of studies and patients included is also very satisfactory. There are only a couple of minor comments. Really wonder, is google translator reliable enough for non-english papers? Authors are very correct about the possible causes of heterogeneity but it's also quite obvious that it's difficult to compare series done with the technology of early 2000 with current technology. It would be also worthwhile, especially for western doctors, if authors could give an estimate of the number needed to overcome the learning curve.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25970

**Title:** Endoscopic submucosal dissection of gastric tumors: A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 00041963

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-27 17:58

**Date reviewed:** 2016-04-06 02:58

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

If the authors give any detail for complications it will be more valuable. (Is this technique need any learnig curve?)

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25970

**Title:** Endoscopic submucosal dissection of gastric tumors: A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 01799104

**Reviewer's country:** Taiwan

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-27 17:58

**Date reviewed:** 2016-04-12 19:06

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors did the largest assessment of the published gastric ESD studies. However, you included subepithelial tumors which involved the muscularis mucosa. Don't you think that there exists difference concerning R0 resection and complication between true epithelial neoplasm and subepithelial tumor? Is it also true between intestinal and schirrhous type gastric adenocarcinoma? Perhaps subgroup analysis would help and both two situations may become to be another confounder, not limit to case volume and experience.