

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 67358

**Title:** Serum gastrin-17 concentration for prediction of upper gastrointestinal tract bleeding risk among peptic ulcer patients

**Reviewer's code:** 05560822

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Egypt

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-04-25

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-05-16 12:27

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-05-25 00:22

**Review time:** 8 Days and 11 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

In this work the authors evaluated the efficacies of serum G-17, PGI, PGII, and PGI/PGII ratio (PGR) for predicting upper gastrointestinal bleeding among peptic ulcer patients. They concluded that serum G-17 is significantly elevated in peptic ulcer patients and higher levels are predictive of complication by upper gastrointestinal bleeding. The Idea is good, the aim was clear, the work was sufficient to achieve the aim with impressive conclusion. The manuscript was written by a readable language but it needs some revision regarding grammar and punctuation. Material and Methods: In this sector the authors included part of the result describing demographic data of the studied population ....it should be transferred to the result sector. The authors did not describe how they test for gastrin-17 and what type of kits used and the duration of fasting. The authors used a fixed reference range for the tested variables without mention of the reference of this normal. I think it was better to use healthy volunteer group as a control for this variables as advised by Liu et al who stated that "Every laboratory should establish its own reference interval for G-17 level" in: J Clin Lab Anal. 2020;34:e23518. |

1 of 5 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcla.23518> J Clin Lab Anal. 2020;34:e23518.

| 1 of 5 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcla.23518> J Clin Lab Anal. 2020;34:e23518.

| 1 of 5 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcla.23518> Results: Add Demographic data here. Table 3 is not informative and significance is not clear. It is better for each table to mention the statistical test used. Discussion: The discussion is weak and needs potentiation by comparing your results with others e.g. Li and Song in Journal of the College of Physicians and Surgeons Pakistan 2020, Vol. 30(12): 1269-1272 Some advices for correction are marked in the manuscript.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 67358

**Title:** Serum gastrin-17 concentration for prediction of upper gastrointestinal tract bleeding risk among peptic ulcer patients

**Reviewer's code:** 05560822

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Egypt

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-04-25

**Reviewer chosen by:** Li-Li Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-22 18:14

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-22 18:54

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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 manuscript is now Ok