

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 58661

Title: Histopathological classification and follow-up analysis of chronic atrophic gastritis

Reviewer's code: 03285323

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-08-05

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-09-02 17:48

Reviewer performed review: 2020-09-06 15:30

Review time: 3 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 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



**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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present a new histopathological classification system for chronic atrophic gastritis (CAG). They have concluded that “this classification system based on the histological, morphological and clinical characteristics of CAG is highly useful for understanding the properties of the lesions and determining the appropriate treatment and follow-up time and interventions.” In generally, this is a good planned and designed study which would contribute the literature. However, I would like to make some comments on its written: i) sentences in Results subsection of Abstract should be past tense rather than present tense; ii) some general information given in Results subsection of Abstract are inappropriate; iii) although the authors have been stated about treatment throughout the text, there is no any treatment modality rather than follow-up; iv) although the have been stated that “We have also discussed the histological criteria for the diagnosis of CAG and its differential diagnosis, as well as the appropriate follow-up time and treatment period.”, there is no any discussion about differential diagnosis, the appropriate follow-up time and treatment period; iv) a reference(s) could be added for citation of further classification systems stated in Introduction; v) the institution name could be removed in the text; vi) as stated, the Treatment subsection of Materials and Methods could be removed, because there is no any treatment rather than follow-up; vi) their new classification system could be better discussed with other old classification systems in order to exhibit its potential advantages; v) the figures could be better illustrated using the arrows.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 58661

Title: Histopathological classification and follow-up analysis of chronic atrophic gastritis

Reviewer's code: 03731607

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-08-05

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-08-31 12:38

Reviewer performed review: 2020-09-09 14:19

Review time: 9 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

The authors submit their original article outlining a new histopathological classification system for chronic atrophic gastritis. The authors included 2248 cases of CAG over a 4 year period and re-reviewed them and performed additional IHC analysis. They then classified all the cases into four distinct subtypes based on histopathology and IHC results. They also included telephone follow up for the cases. They reported treatment success rate and disease aggravation rates. Overall the manuscript is well written with need for only minor English language polishing. However, I have the following questions to the authors for improvement 1) how did the authors quantify treatment success or aggravation based on a telephone follow up? How many patients were lost to follow up. What was the median follow up. Was the number/percentage lost to follow up different amongst the histological subtypes? 2) Table 1. the percentages do not add up to 100% 3) Table 2 is confusing. Why are there three columns under each histological subtype? How did the authors confirm treatment success? 4) Since the goal/aim of the manuscript is to define new histopathological classifications for CAG, the authors need a figure with the characteristics and accompanying images for each histological subtype.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 58661

Title: Histopathological classification and follow-up analysis of chronic atrophic gastritis

Reviewer's code: 04031726

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Attending Doctor, Doctor, Research Fellow, Senior Researcher, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-08-05

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-08-31 20:23

Reviewer performed review: 2020-09-11 01:18

Review time: 10 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" 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



**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>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Visibly the authors have no interest in publishing in the WJG. First, they did not follow the instructions to the authors (<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/204>) regarding the formatting of the article, they did not follow the recommended model, sent the wrong license (sent ICMJE in place), submitted the article in the wrong category. In other words, the impression is that the article was denied in another journal and sent anyway to the WJG. I refuse to evaluate an article under these conditions, a minimum of interest is to respect the journal's rules. This article should be withdrawn by the editor.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 58661

Title: Histopathological classification and follow-up analysis of chronic atrophic gastritis

Reviewer's code: 04031726

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Attending Doctor, Doctor, Research Fellow, Senior Researcher, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-08-05

Reviewer chosen by: Xi-Fang Chen (Quit in 2021)

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-11-15 15:53

Reviewer performed review: 2020-11-17 13:21

Review time: 1 Day and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
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 article remains poorly formulated and structured. In the abstract: 1) Methods: "We divided" is not necessary, You need to describe the methods better. The "Results" is not a discussion. Review this, this is abstract! 2) Core tip: "In conclusion" this is not a conclusion! Review the newspaper's rules. 3) "In our study, we analyzed the clinical manifestations, biopsy site of 2248 CAG cases from four hospitals, and then divided them into four type, simple type, hyperplasia type, IM type and IEN type. In addition, we discussed " This is an introduction, not a result. It needs to be redone. 4) "2248 cases that diagnosed in Feb 2014 to July 2018" Why is the database so old and does not cover 2019 and 2020? 5) "There were 1251 male cases and 997 female cases, divided into five groups by age, less than 40 years old, 41-50 years old, 51-60 years old, 61-70 years old and over 71 years old. The lesion sites contained angular notch, pylorus, gastric body, cardia and fundus were observed. " These are results, not methods. 6) "MUC-1, MUC-2 MUC-5AC and MUC-6" do not use acronyms without first mentioning them. 7) "2248 CAG patients were treated" treated with what? 8) "In addition to the degree of atrophy, CAG also has the type of tissue morphology, such as whether the glands have dilated and / or branched changes, whether there is an increase or decrease in mucous secretion in the glandular cavity, the mucus in the glandular cavity is neutral mucus or acidic mucus, Helicobacter pylori infection and degree, the type and extent of inflammatory cell infiltration; References? 9) "Because the intestinal epithelial metaplasia has a brush margin that does not secrete mucus and a brush margin of goblet cells and absorption cells with acidic mucin" References? 10). ". Hyperplasia type mostly happens between 40-60 years old " Reference? 11) ". Commonly, lesions are limited to quantitative changes with increased mucus secretion. But the lesions can be alleviated or cured after positive treatment. " References? 12) "The cases of the IM type increases with the age, especially among those over 50 years old." References? 13) "Mucus secretion has not only a quantitative change but also a qualitative change,



**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>

containing varying degrees of salivary acid mucus and (or) sulfuric acid mucus.”
References? 14) “. Intraepithelial neoplastic type is commonly developed from the
previous several types ” References? 15) “Decrease of mucus secretion is an
essential marker for the precancerous lesion. Endoscopic Submucosal Dissection (ESD) is
recommended. ” References? 16) Summary of discussion: There is no discussion.
There is no comparison with the current literature, a text completely without references.
It needs to be completely redone. Conclusion: The conclusion only answers the
objective of the study and only that. Its conclusion practically repeats the text and that is
not how it is done. It needs to improve a lot.