

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 53660

Title: Software improvement for evaluation of laryngopharyngeal pH testing (Restech) – a comparison between DataView 3 and 4

Reviewer's code: 02440885

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Germany

Manuscript submission date: 2020-01-03

Reviewer chosen by: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-02-25 10:15

Reviewer performed review: 2020-02-26 00:46

Review time: 14 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	RE-REVIEW	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision		<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision		Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection		<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
				<input type="checkbox"/> General
				<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
				Conflicts-of-Interest:



**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

☐ Yes

☐ No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript entitled "SOFTWARE IMPROVEMENT FOR EVALUATION OF LARYNGOPHARYNGEAL PH TESTING (RESTECH) - A COMPARISON BETWEEN DATAVIEW 3 AND 4" was reviewed. This study is an interesting, and will affect upcoming research in the same field. 1. The authors should describe in more detail the differences between Data view 3 and Data view 4. 2. In particular, the method of correcting the pH drift is considered to have a large effect on the results, so please provide details. 3. I understand that it is common to enter data manually. Please describe the effect of manual input on the result, including the limitation.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

☐ The same title

☐ Duplicate publication

☐ Plagiarism

☐ No

BPG Search:

☐ The same title



**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>

[] Duplicate publication

[] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 53660

Title: Software improvement for evaluation of laryngopharyngeal pH testing (Restech) – a comparison between DataView 3 and 4

Reviewer's code: 02944288

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Lecturer, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: Germany

Manuscript submission date: 2020-01-03

Reviewer chosen by: Le Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-02-25 10:12

Reviewer performed review: 2020-03-01 13:20

Review time: 5 Days and 3 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	RE-REVIEW	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> No	[Y] Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision		[] Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision		Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection		[] Advanced
				[Y] General
				[] No expertise
				Conflicts-of-Interest:



**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

☐ Yes

☐ No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

weaknesses or deficiencies in the manuscript: 1) Small number of patients.. 2) Single center study. 3) Patient's characteristics should be in Methods section. Plus exact number of variables in each group (dataview 3 and 4) should be presented either in the table or in the text.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

☐ The same title

☐ Duplicate publication

☐ Plagiarism

☐ No

BPG Search:

☐ The same title

☐ Duplicate publication

☐ Plagiarism

☐ No