



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 35480

Title: Procedure-related complications in gastric variceal obturation with tissue glue

Reviewer's code: 02441070

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2017-08-07

Date reviewed: 2017-08-08

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"/> 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 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper study procedure-related complications in gastric variceal obturation with tissue glue. The result showed that although EGVO with tissue glue is usually safe and effective, a series of complications can occur during the procedure that may puzzle endoscopists. There is no standard operating procedure for addressing these complications. The cases described in the current study can provide some reference for others.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 35480

Title: Procedure-related complications in gastric variceal obturation with tissue glue

Reviewer’s code: 02999941

Reviewer’s country: United States

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2017-08-07

Date reviewed: 2017-08-11

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 checked="" 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 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

In this observational study that included a large number of patients, the investigators attempted to characterize intraprocedural complications that could occur in gastric variceal obturation with tissue glue. Furthermore, by discussing how the complications were managed in specific cases, the investigators provide the reader with guidance on how to approach these puzzling cases. The study is novel in the size of the patient population discussed and the detail provided from the endoscopies themselves. Major Points: 1. To give the reader a better sense of the patient population, the authors rightfully include Child-Pugh Class to clarify the stage of liver disease. However, because this population was selected without the reader being aware of the “selection” criteria, it would be beneficial to know the platelets and INR – and whether this goes into decision-making. Furthermore, noting that only 18% of the patients were Child-Pugh C, does this go into decision-making for the procedure. This would be relevant to the current paper since one might expect more complications in CP-C or



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

patients with lower platelets/higher INR. 2. Is it protocol that all these patients are placed on Octreotide or somatostatin? The manuscript only mentions a small group that recent somatostatin. Minor Points: 1. Table 1 lists, under Etiology of gastric varices, "Others". Can the authors clarify what this category included? Were these all patients with portal hypertension due to liver disease or were there cases of senestrial portal hypertension? 2. Can the authors clarify the protocol at the institution? Specifically, for whom do you consider repeated sequential therapies? Is the sequence utilized for treatment based on evidence from the current body of literature? 3. How many providers perform this exam? Are there different levels of proficiency that would affect the complication rate?



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 35480

Title: Procedure-related complications in gastric variceal obturation with tissue glue

Reviewer's code: 00724362

Reviewer's country: Slovenia

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2017-08-07

Date reviewed: 2017-08-18

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"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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 is very interesting topic for endoscopists and important article from the clinical point of view. I suggest some minor changes: - please write full name for abbreviations like GOV, IGV. - was there some differncies between the complications according the Child Pugh grade and GOV1, GOV2, IGV1, IGV2?