



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 63704

Title: Feasibility of gastric endoscopic submucosal dissection in elderly patients aged ≥ 80 years

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 02954046

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Portugal

Author’s Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-27 19:47

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-03 13:44

Review time: 5 Days and 17 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

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 authors retrospectively reviewed their ESDs performed in patients older than 80 years. They found ESD to be feasible, safe, and with good outcomes. The topic is very important. The paper is well written and conclusions are based on a good analysis of data. Just a few questions: - Do you perform biopsies around the lesion in a previous endoscopy to assess margins by protocol? Do you think that this is really necessary? What is the evidence that shows that horizontal margins will be free of lesion in a more percentage of cases, comparing with ESDs performed without that protocol? - What is the criteria for second-look endoscopy? In which patients? Do you perform some cases in an ambulatory setting? - What are the criteria for defining non-curative ESD? This must be clear in the methods - Authors said that "Many of the recruited patients had underlying diseases". Data should be objective, not using "many" - Please revise tables legends. Some tables are difficult to read



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 63704

Title: Feasibility of gastric endoscopic submucosal dissection in elderly patients aged \geq 80 years

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05469187

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-29 12:54

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-08 12:30

Review time: 8 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

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

This manuscript aims to define the safety and feasibility of ESD for EGC in the elderly. The study is well written and the statistical analysis appears proper. I only have few comments: -please shorten the discussion section -Table 1. Please specify U upper M medium L lower location of the lesion. "Location, ESD quality (en-bloc or fractional dissection rate)". Please correct en.bloc - Table 4. Please correct the title "Details of patients who had complications of ESD"



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 63704

Title: Feasibility of gastric endoscopic submucosal dissection in elderly patients aged ≥ 80 years

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 03251421

Position: Editor-in-Chief

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: China

Author’s Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-29 12:08

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-12 03:15

Review time: 12 Days and 15 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

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 authors reported the outcome of ESD in elderly patients 80 years or older with gastric cancer. I have the following comments: 1、 On page 11, line 17-19, “However, some studies have reported that ESD carries a higher risk in elderly patients than in younger patients”, please elaborate on it, and discuss the reasons for the different results from the present study. 2、 On page 11, line 11-13, “the rates of bleeding and perforation among patients of all ages were reported to range from 3.7% to 15.6% and 1.2% to 6.7%, respectively”, but the results of this study was even lower, which are 3.4% and 1.1% respectively, please explain why. 3、 It would be more persuasive to include the outcome of all ages or non-elderly patients during the same period, if available.