

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 52715

**Title:** Upper esophageal sphincter abnormalities on high-resolution esophageal manometry with treatment response of type II achalasia

**Reviewer's code:** 02441021

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's country:** Egypt

**Author's country:** China

**Reviewer chosen by:** Le Zhang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-12-05 04:42

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-12-09 14:13

**Review time:** 4 Days and 9 Hours

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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



**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**

Excellent manuscript. Appreciable number of patients. Excellent methodology. Good results

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### *Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

##### *BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 52715

**Title:** Upper esophageal sphincter abnormalities on high-resolution esophageal manometry with treatment response of type II achalasia

**Reviewer's code:** 02155135

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Author's country:** China

**Reviewer chosen by:** Le Zhang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-12-06 05:58

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-12-11 20:08

**Review time:** 5 Days and 14 Hours

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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. The authors have submitted a manuscript entitled “Upper Esophageal Sphincter Abnormalities on High-resolution Esophageal Manometry with Treatment Response of Type II Achalasia The aims of this study were “ • to analyze the types of UES abnormalities present and their frequency in consecutive patients with esophageal motility disorders undergoing HREM according to the current Chicago classification. • to determine the association between common clinical symptoms and UES abnormalities. • to assess the treatment-induced changes in LES and UES objective parameters to evaluate the treatment response among subjects with achalasia and UES dysfunctions. This is an intriguing topic of growing interest in the motility community. This single centre retrospective study enrolled 498 consecutive patients who underwent clinical HREM studies. The interesting work performed by the authors must be acknowledged, although there are some points to be clarified. I am wondering whether the decision to present data on presence/absence of UES abnormalities and then divided into LES normal and LES abnormal groups in accordance with LES restP and LES IRP is appropriate or generates confusion into the Readers. Specifically the novel finding of this study was the analysis of HREM results after dilation beyond the clinical outcome. In Table 5, 17 patients were diagnosed as Achalasia type II and one as type III; however, in the results section you reported Treatment response among subjects with type II achalasia. and described: Ten subjects with achalasia were excluded from the analysis due to a lack of pre- or posttreatment manometric data (Fig. 1). I would like to know the patient with Type III achalasia was among the excluded patients? Did he undergo pneumatic dilation? in the results section Pg 11 line 5 Authors stated that This meant that the treatment was effective in every subject. In my opinion this comment should be transferred in the discussion. Moreover, I did not find in the methods the definition of an effective procedure based on HREM outcomes parameters. Authors wrote: Treatment response was defined qualitatively by Eckardt score and quantitatively by



**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**

posttreatment HREM Please could you better explain what is the definition of favorable treatment response ? Table 7 is very difficult to follow and I am wondering if in only 8 subjects it is appropriate to perform a mixed analysis. Moreover, there is no description of this analysis in the statistical analysis paragraph.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### *Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☒ No

##### *BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☒ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 52715

**Title:** Upper esophageal sphincter abnormalities on high-resolution esophageal manometry with treatment response of type II achalasia

**Reviewer's code:** 01799104

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** AGAF, MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Doctor

**Reviewer's country:** Taiwan

**Author's country:** China

**Reviewer chosen by:** Le Zhang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-12-06 00:24

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-12-15 22:35

**Review time:** 9 Days and 22 Hours

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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors found that UES abnormalities are not uncommon (almost 50%) in their HREM series. The statistical significance is associated with achalasia and ineffective esophageal motility. The former is assumed a compensatory phenomenon as reported by others. The latter may be an interesting finding that arouse further study during the HREM examination. They found that abnormal UES is associated with poor response to pneumatic dilatation in type II achalasia. Though the case number is limited, they may evaluated those with poor response is related to disease duration and severity in which pneumatic dilatation is not a good choice for the treatment.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### *Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

##### *BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No