

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22647

**Title:** Percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy under steady pressure automatically controlled endoscopy: first clinical series

**Reviewer's code:** 00028630

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-09-16 08:38

**Date reviewed:** 2015-10-03 02:03

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" 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

In this article the Authors want to elucidate the safety of PEG under steady pressure automatically controlled endoscopy (SPACE) using carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>). The article is clearly and well written, and the references are exhaustive; but I have some criticisms. MAJOR COMMENTS: 1) the sample size is very small (only 9 patients); so, no definitive conclusion can be drawn. I suggest the Authors to use dubitative sentences in discussion. 2) This study has some interest from the speculative point of view, but in my opinion it has a very poor impact from the clinical point of view. I do not think the use of SPACE results in a significant clinical improvement over the PEG placement in the traditional way (air or CO<sub>2</sub> insufflation). MINOR COMMENTS: 1) DISCUSSION: the first two sentences should be deleted. 2) DISCUSSION: Page 9 lines 6-7 ("CO<sub>2</sub> insufflation during PEG ...."): Only reference 20 deals with these sentence. 3) Figures 3A and 3B are useless, so they should be deleted.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22647

**Title:** Percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy under steady pressure automatically controlled endoscopy: first clinical series

**Reviewer's code:** 00057100

**Reviewer's country:** Cuba

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-09-16 08:38

**Date reviewed:** 2015-10-03 03:41

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

Dear Editor: I have read with interest the manuscript entitled "Percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy under steady pressure automatically controlled endoscopy: first clinical series" by Imaeda and coworkers. The manuscript is very interesting for the readers of WJG. The authors well mentioned that the small size of the study is a limitation; however, randomized controlled trial should be performed comparing the different modalities. It is true that this procedure is performed in a majority of patients with multiple comorbidities that cannot complain of abdominal pain or distension. Well controlled vital signs can be an indicator of pain in patient with cerebrovascular disease and they should be controlled/compared in further studies before, during and after the procedure

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22647

**Title:** Percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy under steady pressure automatically controlled endoscopy: first clinical series

**Reviewer's code:** 00047067

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-09-16 08:38

**Date reviewed:** 2015-09-29 06:01

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 checked="" 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 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

This is a study about the usefulness of steady pressure CO2 insufflation in PEG placement. The language is good, as well as the presentation and photo quality. I would like to know if this procedure can be performed only with the technique of gastropexy that the authors used, or with the through the mouth method too. Does the introduction of snares or forceps affects the steady pressure of CO2?