

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 28832

Title: Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection for Small Submucosal Tumors of the Rectum Compared with Endoscopic Submucosal Resection with a Ligation Device

Reviewer's code: 03647719

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-07-22 15:28

Date reviewed: 2016-08-19 21:40

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

The paper is interesting, but I think some minor revisions are required. - I don't understand why a biopsy was not routinely performed for all the lesions incidentally found; this probably could have led not to do anything for the two lipomas (with consequent risk of perforation or bleeding, without any benefit); moreover you conclude that with ESD the fibrosis caused by the biopsies is not a problem. - For neuroendocrin tumors, that you call carcinoids, the biopsy permits to evaluate the three parameters (morphological and immunohistochemical evaluation and mitotic index) that orient on diagnosis and the correct treatment (after stadation exams, such as a PET gallium scan).

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 28832

Title: Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection for Small Submucosal Tumors of the Rectum Compared with Endoscopic Submucosal Resection with a Ligation Device

Reviewer's code: 03474649

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-07-22 15:28

Date reviewed: 2016-08-19 21:46

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 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 study is original and timely. In the literature similar studies were published. Although the study consist of relatively low number of patients the findings of this study will make contribution to the literature. The findings of this study are relevant to the focus of this journal and will be of interest to its readers. There are some minor English mistakes. It should reviewed by native speaker again. The some part of the discussion section should be rewritten again. The authors should discuss their result with the literature. In the abstract ; -The sentence which is located in method section "whereas 14 lesions were not performed by endoscopic biopsy" is not understandable. I thinkthe authors intended to say different. I think evaluation will be suitable for performed. - The conclusion shoul be written again. It is confusing due to language error. In the introduction I think "are one of the most candidates" is not proper, most may be removed by authors. In the method; same error in the abstract plus "underwent by endoscopic ultrasonography (EUS)" is false, by should be removed. Some part of the discussion needs revision. For example; in the first paragraph of the discussion section ; "The previous studies reported that the ESD group had longer procedure time and



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>

hospitalization than the ESMR-L group. Although our study included other rectal SMTs, such as leiomyoma and lipoma, our results were also inconsistent with the previous studies for carcinoid tumors. In terms of the procedure time and hospitalization, the ESMR-L procedure is more favorable treatment than the ESD procedure." These sentences is confusing. The authors should maket his sentences more clear and understandable.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 28832

Title: Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection for Small Submucosal Tumors of the Rectum Compared with Endoscopic Submucosal Resection with a Ligation Device

Reviewer's code: 00058511

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-07-22 15:28

Date reviewed: 2016-08-24 14:14

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

It is a well written manuscript on interesting topic and but limited number of patients.