



# 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:** 27735

**Title:** Gastric Antral Webs in Adults: A case series characterizing their clinical presentation and management in the modern endoscopic era.

**Reviewer's code:** 00068723

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2016-06-16 14:07

**Date reviewed:** 2016-06-16 18:42

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

This manuscript reports rare cases of gastric antral web (GAW). As the authors state, GAW is not popular among clinicians. To understand this manuscript, information on GAW is insufficient. Is "Aperture less than 1cm" definition of GAW? It would be helpful if diagnostic criteria of GAW are available in the manuscript. Is GAW congenital or acquired? Description of caused of GAW would be helpful to understand GAW. Paragraph "Diagnosis" in Discussion seemed more suitable in Introduction. Some patients with gastric cancer present gastric outlet obstruction. How did the authors differentiate GAW from gastric cancer? Did the authors perform endoscopic ultrasound or the other diagnostic imaging? Definition of GAW is crucial in this manuscript.



## 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:** 27735

**Title:** Gastric Antral Webs in Adults: A case series characterizing their clinical presentation and management in the modern endoscopic era.

**Reviewer's code:** 00058573

**Reviewer's country:** India

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2016-06-16 14:07

**Date reviewed:** 2016-06-19 17:39

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"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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

Quite extensive manuscript especially for a case series. Why was intervention done only in 5 patients ? what was the reason for not intervening in the rest of patients? Please give the year of presentation in Table-1 The Figures should be split in two (a to d as Figure-1, e & f as figure-2) The discussion has to be shortened and the details of five cases need to be curtailed.