

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 28976

Title: Endoscopic Assessment and Management of Sporadic Duodenal Adenomas

Reviewer's code: 02440886

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2016-07-26 08:35

Date reviewed: 2016-09-13 04:10

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 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 checked="" 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	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, I enjoyed reading this paper, that I find interesting due to the paucity of precise international guidelines regarding the topic. All in all the document is readable, even though some specifications in the text could be useful to make it more readable (comments in the revised version), as some concepts are mentioned only in the tables and in the discussion, but not in methods and results. The number of patients is small and cannot lead to statistically significant conclusions, but is still a significant number for a single centre experience; regarding this, I think the title could be more specific and indicate the origin of data, for example "endoscopic assessment...: a single centre experience", it would sound less similar to a guideline or recommendation. The flow charts are well done and clear, they are very useful to focus on conclusions.