



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 41705

Title: Laparoscopic and endoscopic cooperative surgery for gastric tumors: Perspective for actual practice and oncological benefits

Reviewer's code: 02441737

Reviewer's country: Mexico

Science editor: Ruo-Yu Ma

Date sent for review: 2018-08-22

Date reviewed: 2018-08-23

Review time: 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments to the manuscript: Laparoscopic and endoscopic cooperative surgery for gastric tumors: Perspective for actual practice and oncological benefits 1. Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Answer: Yes 2. Abstract.



**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

Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Answer: It would be recommendable for the authors to present some general characteristics of the methodology they follow to make this manuscript. 3. Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Answer: Yes 4. Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Answer: The introduction is adequate and allows a proper understanding of the problem of study. It is recommended that the authors describe some reasons why novel cooperative laparoscopic and endoscopic techniques for gastric tumors, it is only done in Asia and not in other parts of the world? 5. Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Answer: In the indications for the use of LECS, the authors could also mention some recommendations regarding the type of patient. For example, age, sex, BMI, body composition, tumor extension, complications, comorbidity of the patient, among many other factors specific to patients that could be a limitation due to the use of the proposed technique. 6. Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? Answer: Yes What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Answer: Yes 7. Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Answer: It is recommended that the authors present some statistics on the following points applying the novel LECS technique: a) The number of patients attended b) The histological lineage of the tumor c) Sex, age, and some clinical characteristics of the patients seen. d) The number of recurrences e) The type and number of adverse effects to the treatment f) The number of deaths (if any). 8. Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and



**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

tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Answer: It is recommended to place a more descriptive title in all the figures. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Answer: It would be interesting to present the results of the statistics of some results using the Laparoscopic and endoscopic cooperative surgery for gastric tumors in Asia. 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Answer: No 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Answer: Yes 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Answer: Yes 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Answer: Yes 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Answer: Yes

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT



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

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 41705

Title: Laparoscopic and endoscopic cooperative surgery for gastric tumors: Perspective for actual practice and oncological benefits

Reviewer's code: 02534438

Reviewer's country: Croatia

Science editor: Ruo-Yu Ma

Date sent for review: 2018-08-22

Date reviewed: 2018-08-26

Review time: 3 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Sir, I read with care the manuscript titled "Laparoscopic and endoscopic cooperative surgery for gastric tumors: Perspective for actual practice and oncological benefits". The manuscript is a well written review that clarifies up-to date standards



**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

and outlines perspectives in the treatment of early gastric cancer and other submucosal gastric tumors. The LECS procedure is well explained, in both technical and oncological terms, and adequately compared to laparoscopy & endoscopy alone. The only thing I find missing are some numbers: do authors have any numbers to demonstrate feasibility and safety? Published as well as unpublished data on success rates (R0, R1...), mortality, morbidity and follow up should definitely accompany such a comprehensive review.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No