



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15774

**Title:** Diagnostic performance of magnifying narrow-band imaging for early gastric cancer: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 02440526

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-12-09 10:19

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-29 20:55

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

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is a complete, systematic literature review, investigating the utility of ME-NBI in the diagnosis of EGC. The main limit of the paper is the absence of an appropriate reference to the cost of the method also comparing it with the cost of histopathology (Takeuchi Y1, Hanafusa M, Kanzaki H, Ohta T, Hanaoka N. Proposal of a new 'resect and discard' strategy using magnifying narrow band imaging: pilot study of diagnostic accuracy. Dig Endosc. 2014 Apr;26 Suppl 2:90-7. doi: 10.1111/den.12248.) Therefore, at least a paragraph about it should be included.



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15774

**Title:** Diagnostic performance of magnifying narrow-band imaging for early gastric cancer: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 00044980

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-12-09 10:19

**Date reviewed:** 2015-01-09 00:38

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 checked="" 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript is a meta-analysis of magnifying endoscopy using NBI for early gastric cancer. It is well written. However, there are some of comments as follows. Major comment ?Authors mention that diagnostic sensitivity of ME-NBI in depressed lesions is lower than that in not depressed ones. However, most depressed lesions were less than 10 mm in this study. Authors should mention this point in the Discussion section. Minor comment ?Please correct 'simple size' to "sample size."



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15774

**Title:** Diagnostic performance of magnifying narrow-band imaging for early gastric cancer: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 02535364

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-12-09 10:19

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-16 13:40

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input 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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is a meta-analysis on Diagnostic performance of magnifying narrow-band imaging for early gastric cancer. The systematically evaluate diagnostic performance of ME-NBI for EGC was done and the results that ME-NBI is a reliable technique for EGC diagnosis and has a better diagnostic performance than C-WLI in EGC diagnosis could be used for clinic working effectively.



**ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15774

**Title:** Diagnostic performance of magnifying narrow-band imaging for early gastric cancer: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 01588319

**Reviewer's country:** Taiwan

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-12-09 10:19

**Date reviewed:** 2015-01-08 11:04

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" 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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Specific comments: 1. In "Abstract" section, the diagnostic odds ratio for ME-NBI diagnosis of EGC is 102.75 (95% CI, 48.14-219.32), what it means? Please explain it in clinical application. 2. The definition of "EGC" is not clear, please clarify it! 3. In the "Materials and Methods" section, the authors mentioned about TP/FP/TN/FN, however, we only see the statement "In addition, the positive predictive value (PPV) and negative predictive value (NPV) of ME-NBI were 85.0% and 96.3%." in the "Diagnostic performance of ME-NBI" of the "Results" section. Please explain it. Minor comments: This manuscript will be more valuable if the resolution of all the figures can be improved.