Reviewer Assessment **Open Access**

Arnulf H. Hölscher* and Benjamin Babic

New approaches in esophageal carcinomas

DOI 10.1515/iss-2016-0020
Received August 29, 2016; accepted October 18, 2016

***Corresponding author: Arnulf H. Hölscher,**
Center for Esophageal and Gastric Surgery, Agaplesion Markus Krankenhaus, Wilhelm-Epstein-Straße 4, 60431 Frankfurt am Main, Germany,
E-mail: arnulf.hoelscher@fdk.info

Reviewers' Comments to Original Submission

Reviewer 1: Hans-Joachim Meyer

Sep 12, 2016

Reviewer Recommendation Term:	Accept with Minor Revision
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:	N/A

Custom Review Question(s)	Response
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	5 - High/Yes
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?	5 - High/Yes
Are the results/conclusions justified?	5 - High/Yes
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?	5 - High/Yes
How adequate is the data presentation?	5 - High/Yes
Are units and terminology used correctly?	5 - High/Yes
Is the number of cases adequate?	5 - High/Yes
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate?	5 - High/Yes
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?	5 - High/Yes
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	5 - High/Yes
Please rate the practical significance.	5 - High/Yes
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	5 - High/Yes
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	5 - High/Yes
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	4
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	5 - High/Yes
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	4
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.	5 - High/Yes
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript?	Yes

Comments to Author:

- Please find out one way of orthography for esophageal vs. oesophageal (page 1 and 9, table 1)
- Check page 9: ..in listing operative procedures with (instead of sith)
- Are less than <10% vital tumor cells really minor hostpathological response (according to Keller it is score 1B)?
- Review the comment of table 1 (page 7): Do you mean really instead or in case of ?
- Table 2 (page 10): The prognosis is not stated

Reviewer 2: anonymous

Sep 21, 2016

Reviewer Recommendation Term:	Accept with Minor Revision
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:	80

Custom Review Question(s)	Response
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	3
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?	3
Are the results/conclusions justified?	4
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?	5 - High/Yes
How adequate is the data presentation?	4
Are units and terminology used correctly?	3
Is the number of cases adequate?	N/A
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate?	N/A
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?	4
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	4
Please rate the practical significance.	4
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	N/A
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	N/A
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	3
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	4
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	3
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.	4
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript?	Yes

Comments to Author:

This paper is a very fine review about the current multimodality therapy of esophageal cancer, entitled „New Approaches in Esophageal Carcinomas". Therefore, I have no major points of criticism.
However, the authors discussed the paper of Biere et al. published in 2012 and highlighted the findings about the lower rate of pulmonary complications, shorter stay on ICU and duration of hospitalization in esophageal cancer patients undergoing minimally invasive compared with open esophagectomy. Nevertheless, it is important to mention that in this trial, patients of the minimally invasive esophagectomy group received a single-lumen tracheal intubation whereas patients in the open esophagectomy group had a double tracheal intubation with right-sided lung block. Therefore, these two groups can hardly be compared regarding pulmonary complications and the authors should add this information to the manuscript.

Authors' Response to Reviewer Comments

Oct 11, 2016

Dear Prof. Jaehne,

all required corrections and additions to reviewers have been fulfilled.

Thank you for the good critique.

Reviewers' Comments to Revision

Reviewer 1: Hans-Joachim Meyer

Oct 18, 2016

Reviewer Recommendation Term:	Accept
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:	N/A

Custom Review Question(s)	Response
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	5 - High/Yes
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?	5 - High/Yes
Are the results/conclusions justified?	5 - High/Yes
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?	5 - High/Yes
How adequate is the data presentation?	5 - High/Yes
Are units and terminology used correctly?	5 - High/Yes
Is the number of cases adequate?	5 - High/Yes
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate?	5 - High/Yes
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?	5 - High/Yes
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	5 - High/Yes
Please rate the practical significance.	5 - High/Yes
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	5 - High/Yes
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	5 - High/Yes
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	4
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	5 - High/Yes
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	4
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.	5 - High/Yes
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript?	Yes

Comments to Author:
–

Reviewer 2: anonymous

Oct 11, 2016

Reviewer Recommendation Term:	Accept
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:	75

Custom Review Question(s)	Response
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	4
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	3
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?	3
Are the results/conclusions justified?	4
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?	4
How adequate is the data presentation?	3
Are units and terminology used correctly?	4
Is the number of cases adequate?	N/A
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate?	N/A
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?	4
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	3
Please rate the practical significance.	3
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	N/A
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	N/A
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	3
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	4
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	3
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.	4
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript?	Yes

Comments to Author:
Accept the paper in the current form.