

Dear Professor L. S. Ma,

Thank-you for considering this manuscript for publication in World Journal of Gastroenterology. The authors include their responses to the reviewers' comments below.

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 28859

Title: Risk stratification for malignant progression in Barrett's esophagus: gender, age, duration and year of surveillance

Reviewer's code: 03552525

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2016-07-21 09:38

Date reviewed: 2016-08-19 20:32

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 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 type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The relation between Barrett's esophagus and adenocarcinoma was very important. So this study was very interesting, but there were some questions. First, biopsy is not always performed if the Barrett's esophagus is not changed in endoscopic examination. Did all patients always undergo biopsy when they had endoscopy for follow-up? If so, what was the median follow-up span for this? Second, authors should add the table "patient characteristics". Third, were there any statistical differences in age groups?

Authors' reply:

Thank-you for your helpful comments.

RE: biopsy frequency at surveillance endoscopy: There are a number of factors which come into consideration with regard to biopsy protocols. This is a retrospective multicentre study with no control over either surveillance intervals or biopsy protocols. Surveillance practice in the UK has been influenced by national guidelines (first published in 2005, revised at the end of 2013) and prior to this was based on individual endoscopist's preferences, local protocols and the guidelines published by the American College of Gastroenterology. Our analysis has been undertaken using data from the histological reports and excluded any endoscopies where the Barrett's oesophagus segment was not biopsied. The actual biopsy protocol has not been

formally examined during this analysis, but the authors' expectation is that very few endoscopies were undertaken without systematic biopsy and that the frequency of this practice in the latter part of the cohort will have been rare.

RE: Follow-up time: The mean follow-up time was 5.7 years and mean average surveillance interval was 1.61 years.

RE: Patient characteristics: Many of the features of the cohort are described in the first results paragraph and in tables 1-3. A further table could be inserted regarding the baseline characteristics of the cohort, however this study was designed to try to examine risk for individual patients in "real time" based upon changing features at the time of surveillance rather than their baseline characteristics which has been extensively published in other series and on this basis, the authors would prefer to exclude this table.

Reviewer's code: 03035622

Reviewer's country: Czech Republic

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2016-07-21 09:38

Date reviewed: 2016-09-14 05:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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"/> 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"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting and practical paper with several minor errors according to the spelling and grammar.

Authors reply:

Thank-you for your review. We have corrected the errors which we located.

Yours sincerely,

Professor Piers Gatenby