

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 62352

Title: Clinically significant endoscopic findings in patients of dyspepsia with no warning symptoms: A cross-sectional study

Reviewer's code: 05452375

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Denmark

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-11

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-12 10:16

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-17 21:44

Review time: 5 Days and 11 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Please see my comments in the uploaded document.

Dear authors,

Thank you for letting me review this intriguing and very well-written manuscript, and congratulations on successfully completing the study. Please read my comments below and consider revising your manuscript accordingly. I hope that you find my comments to be helpful and constructive.

SUMMARY OF STUDY

This cross-sectional study examined the role of endoscopy in the diagnostic approach to Chinese patients with dyspepsia. Specifically, the prevalence of clinically significant findings (e.g. esophageal lesions, peptic ulcer, malignancy) identified during endoscopy was investigated in dyspeptic Chinese patients without warning symptoms (e.g. family history, unintended weight loss, iron deficiency anemia, etc.). Clinically significant findings were found to be somewhat highly prevalent in this population, and the identified risk factors were found to be male sex, epigastric pain, and Helicobacter pylori infection. This suggests the possible need for a treatment algorithm in China that is different from Western guidelines.

CRITERIA CHECKLIST FOR NEW MANUSCRIPT PEER-REVIEW

Q1) Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript?

A1) In accordance with the STROBE guideline, please revise the title to indicate the study's design (e.g. cross-sectional study, observational study).

Q2) Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript?

A2) Yes. The abstract is informative and accurate.

Q3) Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript?

A3) Yes.

Q4) Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study?

A4) Yes. The Introduction section is very informative, and the rationale and aim are very clear.

Q5) Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail?

A5) The Methods section clearly and mostly accurately explains the methodology of the study. There are a couple of issues:

A5.1) In accordance with item 6 of the STROBE guideline, please explain how and when patients were identified and included in the study.

A5.2) Item 9 of the STROBE guideline specifies: "Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias". Does the authors have any specific comments in relation to this?

A5.3) Item 12c of the STROBE guideline specifies: "Explain how missing data were addressed"; and item 14b specifies "Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest". Does the authors have any specific comments in relation to this?

A5.4) Did any patients decline to participate in the study? In accordance with STROBE item 13b and 13c, please specify reasons for non-participation, and consider using a flow-chart to illustrate patient inclusion.

A5.5) On page 5, lines 6-8, please specify how the Leeds Dyspepsia Questionnaire (LDQ) was adapted to the present study. Were any items of the LDQ removed or added? Did the authors of the present study translate the LDQ into Mandarin, or was a previously translated, adapted, and validated version used? For instance [1].

A5.6) On page 5, line 12, please elaborate on the following statement: "Patients into three subgroups: EPS, PDS, and EPS-PDS". I understand that the classification was performed according to the Rome IV Criteria for Functional Dyspepsia, as accurately described in the Introduction section, but please clearly state this in the Methods section as well.

A5.7) On page 5, line 23, please elaborate on "routine mucosal biopsy". Was the biopsy performed according to the Updated Sydney System [2-3]?

Q6) Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field?

A6) The Results section is an excellent and accurate summary of the study findings, and it does not duplicate the contents of the tables to an inappropriate extent.

Q7) Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently?

A7) The current content of the Discussion section is highly relevant, but incomplete:

A7.1) A more detailed discussion of the study limitations is necessary in order to comply with STROBE item 19. Please consider the limitations of the uncontrolled study design and the possibility of selection bias. On page 13, line 4, please also elaborate on the limitations that a single-center study entails.

A7.2) Could you speculate what additional insight a controlled trial might provide?

A7.3) Please give a more clear description of the possible clinical implications of the findings of the present study. This is necessary to comply with STROBE item 20

Q8) Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends?

A8.1) Please place all figures and tables at the end of the document in compliance with the journal guidelines.

A8.2) In Table 3, please elaborate on "Other esophageal lesions".

A8.3) Please consider using a flow-chart to illustrate patient inclusion.

A8.4) Is it possible to add illustrative photos? Either endoscopic or histological?

Q9) Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics?

A9.1) Was Bonferroni correction used?

A9.2) According to the attached biostatistics certificate, a statistical review of the study was performed by a biomedical statistician. Please comply with the journal guidelines and state this clearly in the Methods section.

Q10) Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units?

A10) Yes.

Q11) References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references?

A11) The references are appropriate and the manuscript cites high-impact journals to an adequate extent.

Q12) Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate?

A12) Yes. The manuscript is well-written with only very minor language issues. The style is appropriate.

A12.1) The journal guidelines specify that a separate Conclusion section is necessary. Please add a clear and accurate conclusion after the Discussion section.

Q13) Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting?

A13) Yes. The authors have attached a completed copy of the STROBE guideline. There are a couple of deviations from the guideline addressed above.

Q14) Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics?

A14) I am not in possession of the title page, and therefore I am unable to acknowledge whether the authors have stated any information regarding institutional review board approval and informed consent. I am not well-versed in Mandarin, and I cannot assess the content of the attached documents.

REFERENCES

1. Leow HR, Ching SM, Sujarita R, Yap CF, Chia YC, Ho SH, Sithambaram S, Tan HJ, Goh KL, Mahadeva S. Mandarin version of the Leeds Dyspepsia Questionnaire: A valid instrument for assessing symptoms in Asians. *J Dig Dis*. 2014 Nov;15(11):591-6. doi: 10.1111/1751-2980.12183.



**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>

2. Dixon MF, Genta RM, Yardley JH, Correa P. Classification and grading of gastritis. The updated Sydney System. International Workshop on the Histopathology of Gastritis, Houston 1994. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 1996 Oct;20(10):1161-81. doi: 10.1097/00000478-199610000-00001.
3. Dixon MF, Genta RM, Yardley JH, Correa P. Histological classification of gastritis and *Helicobacter pylori* infection: an agreement at last? The International Workshop on the Histopathology of Gastritis. *Helicobacter*. 1997 Jul;2 Suppl 1:S17-24. doi: 10.1111/j.1523-5378.1997.06b09.x.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 62352

Title: Clinically significant endoscopic findings in patients of dyspepsia with no warning symptoms: A cross-sectional study

Reviewer's code: 05668311

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Malaysia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-11

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-12 07:23

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-21 06:21

Review time: 8 Days and 22 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 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="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

see the attachment - manuscript peer-review - comment to authors

1. Title. Yes

2 Abstract. Yes

3 Key words. Yes

4 Background. Yes

5 Methods. No

Any reason to exclude (a), (c) and (d) in the exclusion criteria?, it is because in the title its only exclude the warning signs, not others

(a) *predominant symptoms of gastroesophageal reflux disease, such as reflux and heartburn; (c) a previous history of gastrointestinal surgery, malignancy, liver failure, gallbladder stones, and cholecystitis; or (d) use of NSAIDs and PPIs or H2 blockers before the study.*

6 Results.

Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study?

Yes

What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? *Chinese patients with dyspepsia with no warning symptoms should undergo endoscopy, in particular, males, patients with BMI > 25, epigastric pain, or H. pylori infection.*

What/where is the statistical analysis of other subgroup - female patient, other BMI groups etc

7 Discussion. Yes. Good and appropriate discussion

8 Illustrations and tables. Not enough. Need some other results as mentioned above

9 Biostatistics. Yes

10 Units. Yes



**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>

11 References. Appropriate

12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation.

Yes, accurate and appropriate

13 Research methods and reporting. Yes, appropriate research methods and reporting

14 Ethics statements. Not clearly stated. How's the patient managed if the author exclude the patient with *PPIs or H2 blockers before the study.*

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 62352

Title: Clinically significant endoscopic findings in patients of dyspepsia with no warning symptoms: A cross-sectional study

Reviewer's code: 05452375

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Denmark

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-11

Reviewer chosen by: Han Zhang (Part-Time Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-04 18:10

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-05 11:14

Review time: 17 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, Thank you for submitting your thoroughly revised and improved manuscript. I find your responses to be comprehensive and entirely adequate, and all additions to the manuscript are appropriate. Once again, congratulations on completing this interesting and well-reported study.