

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 36567

Title: Maintenance for healed erosive esophagitis: Phase III comparison of vonoprazan with lansoprazole

Reviewer's code: 00073423

Reviewer's country: Lithuania

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-12-01

Date reviewed: 2017-12-02

Review time: 1 Day

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is well designed and performed randomized clinical study. I have just a few minor comments: 1. It remains unclear if the Helicobacter positive patients were enrolled? If yes, was there any difference in recurrence rates according HP status? 2. It would be informative if the authors could stratify the results according age, gender, smoking status and H.pylori status as mentioned above? 3. It is curious why the authors state the Non-Inferiority? Could it not be better to conclude that both doses of Vonoprazan are superior to lansoprazole? 4. Is it possible to show the p values in the Table 5 5. I just could speculate if the Table 5 and Figure 2 adds something important to the manuscript. In the discussion authors recognize that the duration of the study is too short to assess the clinically significant histopathological changes

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 36567

Title: Maintenance for healed erosive esophagitis: Phase III comparison of vonoprazan with lansoprazole

Reviewer's code: 02440966

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-12-01

Date reviewed: 2017-12-03

Review time: 2 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a prospective, randomized, multi-center study for comparing vonoprazan with lansoprazole as maintenance therapy in healed erosive esophagitis (EE). The authors concluded that vonoprazan 10 and 20 mg are not inferior to lansoprazole 15 mg as maintenance therapy for patients with healed EE. These results will give readers a good information on a kind of future treatment option for maintenance therapy of GERD. There are minor issues to be considered. (1) In the Result section of Abstract, the p-value is not correct compared with the main results. (2) The authors described that they performed full-thickness biopsy during endoscopy. Of course, I understand that this means full-mucosal layer biopsy. However, this is hard to understand for general readers. (3) The frequency of nasopharyngitis as a whole is not 4.1%, more than 13%, according to the frequency of nasopharyngitis in each group. (3) The sentence for

abnormal liver function (this is an important potential adverse events of vonoprazan) is hard to understand. (4) Why are p-values of many parameters not-applicable in Table 2?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 36567

Title: Maintenance for healed erosive esophagitis: Phase III comparison of vonoprazan with lansoprazole

Reviewer's code: 03024603

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-12-01

Date reviewed: 2017-12-09

Review time: 8 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I revised the manuscript entitled "Maintenance for healed erosive esophagitis: Phase III comparison of vonoprazan with lansoprazole" The study is interesting and the manuscript is well written. The data provided gives information about maintenance therapy option for GERD. I have few comments 1- The authors mentioned "abnormal liver function", this should be discussed in details including type and severity of the abnormal liver function. 2- Authors should clearly mention whether the Helicobacter positive patients were included in the study or not? And why?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 36567

Title: Maintenance for healed erosive esophagitis: Phase III comparison of vonoprazan with lansoprazole

Reviewer's code: 00503535

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-12-01

Date reviewed: 2017-12-10

Review time: 9 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this clinical study, the authors compared vonoprazan 10 and 20 mg vs lansoprazole 15 mg as maintenance therapy in healed erosive esophagitis (EE), and confirmed the non-inferiority of vonoprazan 10 and 20 mg to lansoprazole 15 mg. In particular, vonoprazan was found to be highly effective among CYP2C19 extensive metabolizers and patients with baseline EE of LA Classification grade C or D. The safety profile of vonoprazan at the administered doses was similar to that of lansoprazole 15 mg. The study was well performed and the article is precisely written and very interesting. The reviewer's only one question was as follow; as shown in Figure 2, the mean levels of serum gastrin, pepsinogen I, and pepsinogen II significantly increased in vonoprazan 10 and 20 mg compared with lansoprazole 15 mg after the start of maintenance therapy. However, clinically significant effects on the gastric mucosa were observed. What were

these increases resulted from? Please discuss it.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 36567

Title: Maintenance for healed erosive esophagitis: Phase III comparison of vonoprazan with lansoprazole

Reviewer's code: 01557050

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-12-01

Date reviewed: 2017-12-13

Review time: 11 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dr. Ashida, et al. investigated 'Maintenance for healed erosive esophagitis: Phase III comparison of vonoprazan with lansoprazole'. The article is informative and well-presented. The reviewer has a minor comment. Comments 1. In Table 3, it is hard to understand the line of Erosive esophagitis grade and CYP2C19 genotype. Please prepare a horizontal line. For example, LA Grade C/D 13.2% (5/38) might be one line bottom.