

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 22618

Title: Peroral endoscopic reduction of dilated gastrojejunal anastomosis after bariatric surgery: Techniques and efficacy

Reviewer's code: 00505559

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-09-17 08:51

Date reviewed: 2015-09-17 22:25

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 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

Thank you for highlighting the paucity of data on this. This really is in the incubation stages and its amazing that the FDA has cleared these devices. However, your writing style is nice and your review is adequate.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 22618

Title: Peroral endoscopic reduction of dilated gastrojejunal anastomosis after bariatric surgery: Techniques and efficacy

Reviewer's code: 03254315

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-09-17 08:51

Date reviewed: 2015-09-18 08:51

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 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

Overall, this is an interesting review of transoral endoscopic fixation of gastrojejunal dilation. The reviewer has several comments: 1) The introduction is long and does not give much detail about transoral gastric pouch outlet reduction. I would recommend revising the introduction to include more history and details regarding this novel method. 2) Was there any exclusion criteria for articles? Does this review include all studies regarding transoral outlet reduction? What was the total number of articles originally found on the initial literature search? 3) I agree with the summary that the findings from these studies suggest that the technique is safe but that larger studies are needed to determine the long-term efficacy. I would recommend highlighting that larger studies, and perhaps randomized controlled trials, are needed before recommending this novel technique as possible standard practice.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 22618

Title: Peroral endoscopic reduction of dilated gastrojejunal anastomosis after bariatric surgery: Techniques and efficacy

Reviewer's code: 02903781

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-09-17 08:51

Date reviewed: 2015-10-06 12:25

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 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

The reference order is not right, check all references, the style is not identical. In the introduction, Powers et al. also noted an average of 40 lb excess weight regain in bariatric surgery patients during a 2 year follow up duration [30]. What does "lb" mean? In the results, The average pre-endoscopic procedure body mass index (BM) among the study participants was 38.68 with range between 27.5 – 48.5 [9,10,11,12]. The BM should be modified to BMI. What is the flowchart for literature search strategies? What is the exclusion criteria of the literature? The author should analyse the pouch size, alimentary limb length, and biliopancreatic limb length of each study.