



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 82503

Title: How far is the endoscopist to blame for a percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy complication?

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06462052

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-26 03:16

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-26 04:33

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> <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



**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

Present study provided a relatively complete description of major procedural complications in Percutaneous Endoscopic Gastrostomy, helping professionals and non-professionals have a better understanding of PEG and its complications. However, the review shall be more referential with the following modifications. First of all, the authors could summarize the results of reviewing into a table, instead of text throughout the whole manuscript, which could be more readable. Secondly, the authors should come out with the prevention and treatment methods of the various complications caused by PEG, which will make this article more instructive. Otherwise, the significance of this article will be greatly reduced. Finally, although present article had been revised by a native English speaker, the grammar should still be greatly revised for better understanding and all text errors should be reviewed and revised.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 82503

Title: How far is the endoscopist to blame for a percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy complication?

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05301514

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-04 15:30

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-14 04:50

Review time: 9 Days and 13 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
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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 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 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

This study focuses on major complications associated with PEG procedures. The authors scrutinized relevant case reports. This study is very interesting and instructive. The manuscript is well-written. However, I have several comments below:

- INTRODUCTION** First sentence of last paragraph: For the present commentary review we decided to focus on those complications that... Comment: The authors should revise “those complications” to “major complications” because the authors excluded all cases of minor complications.
- RESULTS** Figure 1: Studies Included in review [n = 114] Comment: “n=114” is incorrect. The authors themselves described “A total of 88 complications out of the 575 cases screened were identified”. Therefore, “n=88” is correct. Furthermore, the total number of cases of colon injuries (n=50), liver injuries (n=14), vascular injuries/bleeding (n=12), and splanchnic injuries (n=11) is 87. The total number of cases should be 88. Please correct.
- DISCUSSION** Liver injuries, second



**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

paragraph: it proves more reliable when performed in such cases, since it is easier for blood to be suctioned into the syringe in relation to compact feces as in the case of the colon... Comment: The meaning of this sentence is unclear. Did the authors mean that liver injuries are easier to detect than colon injuries because blood can be suctioned in the case of liver injuries? Please rewrite this sentence to make it clearer. ...and easily [!] ...notice it! ...urgent endoscopic gastrostomy! Comment: I think exclamation marks should be avoided in medical papers. Comment: The authors should state the limitations of this study before the conclusion. The pull method is a common method for PEG, but the introducer method is also one of the common methods for PEG. Depending on the countries and region, the introducer method is the standard technique. This study focuses only on the pull method, therefore some statements in this study may not be applicable to the introducer method.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 82503

Title: How far is the endoscopist to blame for a percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy complication?

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06462052

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-21

Reviewer chosen by: Han Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-15 07:07

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-15 07:15

Review time: 1 Hour

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

All questions and suggestions were handled well and the manuscript was recommended to be accepted.