PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 65918

Title: Association between mucosal surface pattern under near focus technology and Helicobacter pylori infection

Reviewer's code: 05936182

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Thailand

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-20 17:41

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-20 18:02

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Firstly, thank you for opportunity to review very interested article. 1. The title reflect the main subject about endoscopy for the detection for Helicobacter pylori, title was clear and easy to understand but in the text "Near focus high-definition" I suggest add the word "technique" or "technology" after that to promote interested article for reader. 2. The abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript. 3. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. 4. The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status, and significance of the study. The authors explain progression of Near Focus technology which new use in Western countries. 5. The manuscript describe methods in adequate detail, study subjects were clear, with demonstrate IRB number or text to human ethics consideration. I suggest the authors explain about "examinations were performed by nine senior endoscopists" in the context of research involvement, methods to validate all comments and information bias. 6. The research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study. I suggest the authors revise Figure 2: Study flowchart, size of text. 7. The manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly, and logically. 8. Tables and figures sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. 9. The manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics. 10. The manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study evaluated the near-focus technology to assess the association between mucosal surface pattern and Helicobacter pylori infection.   1 Title. This study is not a diagnostic study and the aim of near-focus technology is not to detect the Helicobacter pylori infection. It would be better, like "The association between mucosal surface pattern under near-focus technology and Helicobacter pylori infection".   2 Abstract. The abstract summarized and reflect the work described in the manuscript.   3 Key words. It is OK.   4 Background. The manuscript adequately describes the background and present status of the study. However, a diagnostic study needs to explain the clinical significance, especially under current easy-use precise detection methods, like rapid urease test and Carbon 13 breath test system.   5 Methods. Why does a cross-section study consider the drop-out rate(25%) on page 8? The sample size was calculated under the sensitivity of 94% and specificity of 95%, which is far better than the current results. An association analysis, like Chi2 and logistic regression, may be reasonable for the hypothesis.   6 Results. If the hypothesis and statistical methods changed, the results need to be revised.   7 Discussion. The lower efficiency of current results than previous results needs to be discussed. The clinical significance needs to be further illustrated.   8 Illustrations and tables. The statistical test in Table 1 needs to be supplied because this study is not RCT.   9 Biostatistics. The statistical test in Table 1 needs to be supplied.   10 Units. It is OK.   11 References. Some new references need to be updated.   12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. It is OK.   13 Research methods and reporting. Authors prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, STROBE Statement.   14 Ethics statements. The manuscript meets the requirements of ethics.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major Comments This manuscript shows that near focus high-definition endoscopic finding has the possibility to detect of gastric infection by H. pylori. It is well written, however the results have been already well known and shared in countries. It remains questionable to place the superiority solely on the fact that this manuscript is based on the patients in Western country. In addition, the manuscript has the following concerns; #1 As the study design, it should be stated whether all endoscopists have been blinded to previous and present H. Pylori infection. #2 In result, authors describe that upon initial examination of the gastric body with S-HD (Table 2), the finding with the best sensitivity for Hp detection was enanthema (80.9%), present in 75 patients. Exudate (99.3%), nodularity (97.1%), and atrophy (95.7%) demonstrated better specificity values, but with low sensitivity (6.4%-19.1%). The term of enanthema is not familiar as an endoscopic term. These endoscopic findings are need to be demonstrated as figures. Minor comments #1 The authors describe that High definition (HD) magnification endoscopy (ME) can increase the image view by more than 100 times in introduction. More specific expression is desirable. #2 Capitalize the beginning of the sentence in abstract. #3 Figures and tables are difficult to see as a whole. The fonts should be aligned. #4 About Figure 1, it is easier for the reader to understand the figure legend if it is along with the expression in the text. Also, the classification is by Anagnostopoulos not by Yagi. #5 The abbreviation for Helicobacter Pylori is not unified.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 65918

Title: Association between mucosal surface pattern under near focus technology and Helicobacter pylori infection

Reviewer's code: 05934641

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Associate Research Scientist, Senior Researcher, Senior Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-14

Reviewer chosen by: Chen-Chen Gao

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-03 13:43

Reviewer performed review: 2021-09-03 13:50

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have answered and corrected the my comments appropriately.