

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 31641

**Title:** Russell body gastritis with Dutcher bodies evaluated using magnification endoscopy

**Reviewer's code:** 00503883

**Reviewer's country:** Brazil

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-12-01 09:47

**Date reviewed:** 2017-01-06 03:16

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 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 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

Excellent case report article. High quality images of endoscopic findings and histopathologic features. Adequate discussion and literature review. Fluent English text.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 31641

**Title:** Russell body gastritis with Dutcher bodies evaluated using magnification endoscopy

**Reviewer's code:** 03009149

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-12-01 09:47

**Date reviewed:** 2017-01-20 10:55

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

Yorita et al. presented a rare case of Russel body gastritis, which was performed biopsy and subsequent endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD). The manuscript is interesting, but could be improved with clarification of the following points: 1. Helicobacter pylori (H. pylori) status was evaluated with serum antibody test. It, however, indicates just a history of the H. pylori infection. To clarify the current H. pylori status and the severity of the bacterial infection, please show the H. pylori status with biopsy and/or ESD specimen. 2. The authors showed the endoscopic examination before eradication at the initial diagnosis in Fig. 1. Please show the endoscopic view after eradication to reveal how the lesion had been changed. 3. In the Fig. 2, it is not clear which photos are from biopsy and which were from ESD samples. Please show the hematoxylin-eosin stained entire histology from ESD as well. 4. For the "Present case" in Table 1, the explanation for the follow-up is not sufficient.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 31641

**Title:** Russell body gastritis with Dutcher bodies evaluated using magnification endoscopy

**Reviewer's code:** 03700100

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-12-01 09:47

**Date reviewed:** 2017-01-22 17:57

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input checked="" 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

This paper reports a case of Russell body gastritis with Dutcher bodies evaluated using magnification endoscopy. However, This is not the first case of RBG evaluated by M-NBI and pathological evaluation of the lesion. Nishimura et al has already reported one in ACG Case Rep J. 2016 Aug 3;3(4):e96, which impairs the clinical significance of this case report. Besides, the manuscript needs to be revised further. My suggestions are as follows. Comments: 1. There are too many grammatical errors in the manuscript needed to be taken care. For example, in the abstract, "the reason for" and "is due to" are duplicate. In the last sentence, using "but which..." is wrong definitely. 2. please add a scale bar in Figure 2C and 2D. 3. please add the machine model of M-NBI and the producer of the antibodies CD79a, multiple myeloma oncogene 1 and so on. 4. The second paragraph from bottom in the discussion part is too lengthy, please modify it to be more concise.