

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 71354

Title: Surveillance strategies for precancerous gastric conditions after *Helicobacter pylori* eradication: There is still need for a tailored approach

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05058806

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: PhD

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-05 08:40

Reviewer performed review: 2021-09-09 08:25

Review time: 3 Days and 23 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have submitted a letter article on the review by Weng CY et al. I agree with the authors on the importance of risk stratification of gastric cancer. Even with a high-resolution endoscope, if morphological changes do not appear, genetic and epigenetic changes in epithelial cells cannot be detected. In addition, the report by Asada et al.1), which examined the relationship between methylation abnormalities and ectopic gastric cancer, is extremely important as a predictor. The authors need to mention this point a little. Asada K, Nakajima T, Shimazu T, et al. Demonstration of the usefulness of epigenetic cancer risk prediction by a multicentre prospective cohort study. Gut. 2015 Mar; 64 (3): 388-96.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 71354

Title: Surveillance strategies for precancerous gastric conditions after *Helicobacter pylori* eradication: There is still need for a tailored approach

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03971255

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-07 11:11

Reviewer performed review: 2021-09-10 08:19

Review time: 2 Days and 21 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
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

In this letter, authors conclude that “Additional studies are yet required to sharpen the hazard stratification of patients with the greatest chance of gastric cancer evolution” and conduct a comprehensive analysis. However, there are some issues that need to be explored in this letter.

1. Dinis-Ribeiro M et al showed that “have a negative family history for GC do not require surveillance”. Does the author agree with this view?
2. The authors suggest that “further studies are still needed to refine the risk stratification of patients with the highest risk of gastric malignancy development”. Can they give a brief explanation?
3. The risk of gastric neoplasia is affected by race, ethnicity and immigration, the authors note. Then, in terms of people's life and rest, whether its impact on gastric neoplasia can't be ignored, whether there is research significance?
4. The authors suggest that cost-effectiveness strategies for H. pylori positive patients should be better optimized. Are they thinking in terms of long-term surveillance or short-interval endoscopic surveillance?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 71354

Title: Surveillance strategies for precancerous gastric conditions after *Helicobacter pylori* eradication: There is still need for a tailored approach

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05465713

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Attending Doctor, Doctor, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-08 11:55

Reviewer performed review: 2021-09-16 10:10

Review time: 7 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	[<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Grade A: Excellent [<input type="radio"/>] Grade B: Very good [<input type="radio"/>] Grade C: Good [<input type="radio"/>] Grade D: Fair [<input type="radio"/>] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Grade A: Priority publishing [<input type="radio"/>] Grade B: Minor language polishing [<input type="radio"/>] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [<input type="radio"/>] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Accept (High priority) [<input type="radio"/>] Accept (General priority) [<input type="radio"/>] Minor revision [<input type="radio"/>] Major revision [<input type="radio"/>] Rejection
Re-review	[<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Yes [<input type="radio"/>] 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

The authors provided useful conclusions for clinical practice and future study. The proofs are sound and the reviewing of published studies is profound. As far as I am concerned, this manuscript should be accepted with high priority.