

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 82319

Title: Ineffective Esophageal Motility is Associated with Acute Rejection After Lung Transplantation Independent of Gastroesophageal Reflux

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03252977

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Attending Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Croatia

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-13 06:07

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-23 07:51

Review time: 10 Days and 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in 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 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

Dear Authors, I would like to congratulate you on the work you have done! Your work is very interesting and also educative - I'm sure it will be useful for all clinicians who deal with severe lung diseases. While I was reading the manuscript, I was only concerned with the fact that you used Chicago v 3.0, but in the end you nicely explained your limitations and therefore I have nothing further to object. Kindest regards

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 82319

Title: Ineffective Esophageal Motility is Associated with Acute Rejection After Lung Transplantation Independent of Gastroesophageal Reflux

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04025443

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Senior Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-26 05:26

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-02 13:00

Review time: 7 Days and 7 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

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
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

I read with pleasure and interest the paper by Wai-Kit Lo and colleagues entitled "Ineffective Esophageal Motility is Associated with Acute Rejection After Lung Transplantation Independent of Gastroesophageal Reflux". It is based on the data obtained in a retrospective cohort trial that analyzed association between pre-existing ineffective esophageal motility (established with high-resolution esophageal manometry) and risk of acute resection after lung transplantation. The results really fill knowledge gaps, bring new to the field and may be interesting to the readers. The manuscript is well-written. I have only a few minor comments. 1. Please, add the information about the type of manometry system used in the study (i.e., water-perfused or solid state). If both, could this heterogeneity impact the results? 2. Please, disclose the abbreviations at first mention (including tables). 3. Could there be an influence of chronic pulmonary diseases on esophageal motility (including medications used for their treatment)? I suppose this worth mentioning in the Discussion.