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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
At present, there are many articles on the application of EUS in esophageal cancer. No new viewpoints have been proposed in this review article.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This is a well-written review article on the role of EUS in esophageal cancer. However, there are some recommendations for the author: 1. The second paragraph on page 1, “The workup for esophageal (and esophagogastric junction cancers) …..” Dese it require a bracket? 2. The last paragraph on page 3, “EUS, however, is less accurate for early-stage lesions (T1 or T2)”….. Given the fact that endoscopic resection (particularly endoscopic submucosal dissection) is increasing used for the treatment of pT1a esophageal cancers, I recommend that the authors add more detailed information about the role of EUS in pT1a/pT1b esophageal cancer staging. 3. The third paragraph on page 4, “In 75-82% of cases, high frequency probes (12-20 MHz) can help distinguish T1a from T1b disease.” Is this a personal opinion, or is it based on some evidence (because there is no any reference). Besides, for what kind of cases? 4. The fourth paragraph on page 4, “a recent meta-analysis and systematic review found the sensitivity and specificity of T1, T2, T3, T4 staging by EUS to be 23%, 29%, 81%, and 43% respectively” It seems that sensitivity or specificity data is missing. 5. The last paragraph on page 5, “it also has the added advantage to perform FNA and/or FNB of surrounding lymph nodes and organs”…….. Is there any reference about EUS combined with FNB? If so, please add.
**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 68325

**Title:** Role of endoscopic ultrasound in esophageal cancer

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer’s code:** 05492127

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Academic Research, Doctor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** China

**Author’s Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-05-19

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-05-21 17:12

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-05-30 08:47

**Review time:** 8 Days and 15 Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific quality</th>
<th>[ ] Grade A: Excellent</th>
<th>[ ] Grade B: Very good</th>
<th>[ ] Grade C: Good</th>
<th>[ ] Grade D: Fair</th>
<th>[ ] Grade E: Do not publish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language quality</td>
<td>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing</td>
<td>[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing</td>
<td>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing</td>
<td>[ ] Grade D: Rejection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>[ ] Accept (High priority)</td>
<td>[ ] Accept (General priority)</td>
<td>[ ] Minor revision</td>
<td>[ ] Major revision</td>
<td>[ ] Rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-review</td>
<td>[ ] Yes</td>
<td>[ ] No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewer</td>
<td>Peer-Reviewer: [ ] Anonymous</td>
<td>[ ] Onymous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This review evaluated the Role of EUS in Esophageal Cancer. Including the role of the staging and restaging in Esophageal Cancer. Overall is good. However, there were some areas for improvement. 1. The review should have a abstract 2. The references should including more literature which were within 5 years.