



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 88949

Title: Causal associations between gastroesophageal reflux disease and essential hypertension: A bidirectional Mendelian randomization study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00189256

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, MDS, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Ukraine

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-16

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-13 10:45

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-22 22:14

Review time: 9 Days and 11 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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 of the article proposed an interesting work design The MR-Egger intercept test, Cochran’s Q test and “leave-one-out” sensitivity analysis were performed to evaluate the horizontal pleiotropy, heterogeneities, and stability of single instrumental variable. Bidirectional mendelian randomization study found that GERD was positively associated with the risk of essential hypertension, suggesting a new prevent strategy and therapeutic perspectives of essential hypertension in patients with GERD.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 88949

Title: Causal associations between gastroesophageal reflux disease and essential hypertension: A bidirectional Mendelian randomization study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02567669

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Emeritus Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Germany

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-16

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-14 16:03

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-23 10:24

Review time: 8 Days and 18 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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

This manuscript describes a highly sophisticated method to find a correlation between GERD and hypertension. The method itself cannot be evaluated me, because I'm not familiar with these methods. However, I assume that the analysis has been performed right. From the point of view of a gastroenterologist and clinician, I have some remarks: In the abstract, the authors use abbreviations which are less understandable, SNP, MR-Egger, IVW. How can this be avoided? In the text: The authors use "incidence". Instead it is prevalence Is this hypertension, as the authors demonstrate, "essential" hypertension or secondary hypertension? Essential hypertension means that no underlying cause can be found. However, as shown in this paper, there is a cause for hypertension, even if the relation is only a statistical relation. The physiological explanations of the relation are rather hypothetical. However, several studies often start with hypotheses.