



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 92029

Title: Endoscopic Full-Thickness Plication along with Argon Plasma Coagulation for the treatment of PPI-dependent Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease: A Single-Center Retrospective Study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 05382551

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Spain

Author’s Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2024-01-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-01-14 13:05

Reviewer performed review: 2024-01-14 13:15

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection



Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper is well-written and presents an interesting topic. The results are well-organized and add value to the field. However, there are a few areas that could be improved to increase the likelihood of acceptance. First, the introduction could be improved by providing more motivation for the work and discussing the state of the art in more detail. This would help to contextualize the contribution of the paper and make it more compelling to readers. Second, the materials and methods section could be improved by providing more detail about the specific implementation of the proposed system. This would help readers to understand how the results were obtained and to replicate the work. Finally, the conclusions could be improved by more clearly stating the scientific contribution of the paper. This could be done by discussing the implications of the results for future research or applications. Specifically, the authors could address the following areas: 1)Introduction: Provide more motivation for the work, such as by discussing the importance of fault detection in safety-critical systems. Discuss the state of the art in more detail, including the advantages and disadvantages of existing approaches. 2)Materials and methods: Provide more detail about the specific implementation of the proposed system, such as the hardware and software components used. Discuss the limitations of the implementation and how they could be addressed in future work. 3) Conclusions: Clearly state the scientific contribution of the paper, such as by discussing the implications of the results for future research or applications. By addressing these areas, the authors could improve the quality of the paper and increase the likelihood of acceptance.

Dear reviewer,

Thank you very much for your questions.

1. We have improved the introduction by providing more motivation for the work and have discussed the state of the art in more detail. We have made effort to make the narrative more compelling to readers.
2. The materials and methods section has been improved by providing more detail about the specific implementation of the proposed system. This would enable the readers to understand how the results were obtained and to replicate the work.



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: office@baishideng.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

3. The conclusions have been improved by more clearly stating the scientific contribution of the paper.