PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 67602

Title: Indications and outcomes of endoscopic resection for non-pedunculated colorectal lesions: A narrative review

Reviewer's code: 03724397

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chairman, Chief Doctor, Director, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-28 16:10

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-05 00:43

Review time: 6 Days and 8 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study analyzed all meta-analyses comparing EMR versus ESD outcomes for colorectal sessile or non-polypoid lesions of any size, preoperatively estimated as non-invasive. The research topics are interesting, but there may be some defects. Why only summarize all the meta-analyses? Some studies may not be included in the meta-analyses.This study lists a lot of data, especially in Table 1, but the source is not indicated, which reduces the credibility. It is suggested to add references. This study describe the best diagnostic strategies for predicting malignancy based on the morphologic features of colorectal non-pedunculated lesions according to current endoscopic technology, to choose wisely among endoscopic mucosal resection (EMR) and ESD procedures. The conclusion of this study is common, and there is no significant difference compared with previous published studies.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 67602

Title: Indications and outcomes of endoscopic resection for non-pedunculated colorectal lesions: A narrative review

Reviewer's code: 04089095

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-28 15:57

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-07 08:35

Review time: 8 Days and 16 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This narrative review aims to describe the best diagnostic strategies for predicting malignancy based on the morphologic features of colorectal non-pedunculated lesions according to current endoscopic technology, to choose wisely among EMR and ESD procedures. The study is well conducted and the authors' conclusions rely on appropriate references. I appreciate the authors' efforts for this review, and I have some comments described hereafter: Point 1: All acronyms should be explained the first time they appear in the text, such as "EMR", "ESD". Point 2: Too many subheadings at the same level are not logical. For example, with respect to EMR/ESD, you can use a headings first, and then subheadings for detailed classification. Point 3: The lack of figures or tables directly indicates the differences between various endoscopes. In addition, why is Table 2 the format of the picture? Point 4: The content is complete, but the conclusion is too simple. The core question concerns the SMIC assessment system and the choice of ESD or EMR, please clarify.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 67602

Title: Indications and outcomes of endoscopic resection for non-pedunculated colorectal lesions: A narrative review

Reviewer's code: 02953722

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Staff Physician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-28 09:52

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-09 16:31

Review time: 11 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	[　] Grade A: Excellent　　[　] Grade B: Very good　　[Y] Grade C: Good [　] Grade D: Fair　　[　] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[　] Grade A: Priority publishing　　[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [　] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing　　[　] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[　] Accept (High priority)　　[　] Accept (General priority) [　] Minor revision　　[Y] Major revision　　[　] Rejection
Re-review	[　] Yes　　[Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous　　[　] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [　] Yes　　[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors: this is a very complete review about a hot topic in endoscopy. However, I find the structure of the manuscript a bit confusing, there is a lot of information about endoscopic resection but a more focused approach should be preferable.