

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 20970

**Title:** Endoscopic treatment of esophageal achalasia

**Reviewer's code:** 03259368

**Reviewer's country:** Germany

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-06-29 12:28

**Date reviewed:** 2015-07-02 01:02

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 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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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 present an interesting editorial on achalasia and it's treatment and should be commended for their work. However, the manuscript needs major revisions. There are a couple of language and formatting issues throughout the manuscript. I would also suggest some pictures from the authors own practice for demonstration of the procedures for the unexperienced reader. The biggest issue is the decisionmaking paragraph. There is no guidance to decisionmaking at all in this paragraph. I would expect an idea what patients should be referred for the different treatment options and why. In my opinion this needs to be redone before acceptance of this manuscript. Here is a detailed overview of issues in the paper: As the title of the paper is "Endoscopic treatment of esophageal achalasia." I do not understand why "a. Pharmacological Treatment" is part of the different endoscopic treatment options. I would just explain botox treatment here. I recommend including the Heller myotomy to the manuscript paragraph "decision making" and also "a. Pharmacological Treatment". Pneumatic dilatation: "The procedure is usually performed as an outpatient surgery under conscious sedation in the morning, the patient is then observed for 2-6 hours and can return to normal activities the subsequent day" Please either provide a reference or

state that this is your standard of care. Some centers may keep these patients overnight. POEM  
When are patients discharged after POEM at the authors institution? I think this is an important  
information. Stents ?All the authors concluded that temporary stent placement is an effective  
treatment for achalasia and could be used for treating carefully selected cases.” I do not think that  
this is an accurate conclusion for the stenting paragraph. There is no evidence that stenting helps for  
achalasia on the long run. I would recommend saying that ?SEMS is a promising option that might  
relieve symptoms on the mid-term. ? Decision making Age, sex, and manometric type by HRM  
are also predictors of responsiveness to treatment. Provide reference. This paragraph seems a  
repetition from before. The authors should provide a clear decisionmaking process here, otherwise  
the manuscript is not helpful. I recommend a decisionmaking tree here that includes LHM also.  
Laparoscopic Heller Myotomy. At our institution, we are experiencing a 0% perforation rate using  
robotic assistance for the myotomy. I suggest at least adding a paragraph on this rather novel  
treatment to this paragraph and adding the following reference: Horgan S, Galvani C, Gorodner MV,  
Omelanczuk P, Elli F, Moser F, Durand L, Caracoché M, Nefá J, Bustos S, Donahue P, Ferraina P.  
Robotic-assisted Heller myotomy versus laparoscopic Heller myotomy for the treatment of  
esophageal achalasia: multicenter study. J Gastrointest Surg. 2005 Nov;9(8):1020-9; discussion 1029-30.  
Conclusion Missing. Please add a clear conclusion.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 20970

**Title:** Endoscopic treatment of esophageal achalasia

**Reviewer's code:** 03259215

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-06-29 12:28

**Date reviewed:** 2015-07-13 08:35

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 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

I read with interest the article on management of achalasia. The article briefly goes over the etiology and diagnosis of achalasia and then describes the treatment modalities. I ll like to suggest a few additions to the article. 1. Endoscopy images, manometric images, radiographic images and cartoons will make the reader understand the text much better. 2. Explanation of different scoring systems used in paper in a table form 3. Finally a little information on comparative studies between LHM and POEM will be appropriate.