



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30217

Title: Evolving management of Metaplasia & Dysplasia in Barrett's epithelium

Reviewer's code: 03646568

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-09-20 20:43

Date reviewed: 2016-09-29 17:21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

To the Editors of World Journal of Gastroenterology. Re: Review entitled Evolving management of Metaplasia & Dysplasia in Barrett's epithelium This review well summarizes the background, diagnosis and management of esophageal Barrett. The content of the review is constructed so that many readers can understand well. It is likely to be good the sections of management is constructed by three parts, non-dysplasia, low grade dysplasia and high grade dysplasia. Therefore, this review might be useful for readers for better understanding of esophageal Barrett and is worth while to be published in the Review section of the World Journal of Gastroenterology. Minor revision: Spelling of ABSRTACT is mistyped.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30217

Title: Evolving management of Metaplasia & Dysplasia in Barrett's epithelium

Reviewer's code: 03219312

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-09-20 20:43

Date reviewed: 2016-10-03 18:04

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I think this is a well written review. I only had a few comments/suggestions to make. First, I think your Table 2 is a key table in the paper. I would expand the discussion a little more to emphasize the differences in managing Barrett's. Second, I would point out the limitations of any screening program would be that some patients without traditional risk factors (eg, male gender) can still present with Barrett's. A paper touching briefly on this is: Desilets DJ, Nathanson BH, Navab F. Barrett's esophagus in practice: gender and screening issues. Journal of Men's Health. 2014 Dec 1;11(4):177-82 It would be interesting if you could add a paragraph (I realize you have word limit constraints) or a few sentences highlighting the pros and cons of current screening proposals for Barrett's. Otherwise, I think the paper reads well.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30217

Title: Evolving management of Metaplasia & Dysplasia in Barrett's epithelium

Reviewer's code: 00035938

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-09-20 20:43

Date reviewed: 2016-10-09 02:51

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

General comments: R Evans et coworkers present a review on epidemiology of Barrett's oesophagus and its progression to high grade dysplasia and oesophageal cancer. They compare current management guidelines for non-dysplastic and dysplastic Barrett's oesophagus. However, often the reader would be better advised to read the current guideline directly. The strength of the paper is the comparison of different guidelines. Specific comments: Abstract: Penultimate sentence in the abstract needs rephrasing. The review contains spelling mistakes and several incorrect phrases: In the first sentence under "Screening" it is stated that screening is a way to reduce cancer risk. Endoscopic screening is not ineffective in identifying BO but too costly and inefficient. The complete remission rate of 90% for ER refers to complete endoscopic resection-this should be clearly stated. The discussion on surgical mortality rates are confusing: How can oesophagectomy be considered for "BO alone"?