



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Ms: 2074

Title: Use of surface electromyography for diagnosing dysphagia in patients with cerebral palsy

Reviewer code: 00039422

Science editor: x.x.song@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-01-25 15:33

Date reviewed: 2013-02-01 19:55

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS

CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO EDITOR:

GENERAL COMMENTS (1) Importance and significance of the research; novelty and innovation a. In this paper the authors evaluate sEMG as a new helpful tool for the screening and early diagnosis of dysphagia in patients with cerebral palsy: the conclusion of the authors is that sEMG may be useful in the diagnosis of OPD. Evaluation of OPD due to brainstem stroke by sEMG was already reported, but this paper is the first to assess sEMG as a screening tool in cerebral palsy b. The issue considering sEMG simpler, faster, and at lower cost than video fluoroscopic study is questionable and should be confirmed in further studies. c. Apart these concerns, sEMG may indeed be proposed as a tool to screen patients with possible OPD but the doubts if this will be a sufficient assessment and if patients will need further diagnostic procedures to confirm the diagnosis, may reduce its cost-benefit. (2) Presentation and readability a. The paper is well presented and written in a good english (3) Ethics of the research a. No concerns about ethical issues **SPECIFIC**

COMMENTS Title: It reflects contents of the study. Abstract: It gives a clear explanation of the research. Materials and methods: A detailed description of the methods and of the statistical evaluation is provided. There are concerns about the small sample size and about the control group, as stated by the authors in the paragraph regarding limitations of the study. Results: The results provide sufficient evidence or data to draw the conclusion of the authors. A description of the fluoroscopic evaluation that has been performed in all patients of the study and a comparison with sEMG (may be in a table) would give more strength to the study. A detailed report of dysphagia score of patients with OPD would be quite helpful. Presumably this group is not homogeneous from this point of view and likely sEMG could be more reliable in some subgroups. With a sensitivity rate of 85% and positive predictive value of 73.9% it may be doubtful to consider sEMG as the gold



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

standard for the diagnosis of OPD. Discussion: Well organized. Conclusions are acceptable. See above References: References are appropriate and updated. Tables and figures: Tables concerning fluoroscopy and dysphagia scores would be welcomed

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

GENERAL COMMENTS (1) Importance and significance of the research; novelty and innovation a. In this paper the authors evaluate sEMG as a new helpful tool for the screening and early diagnosis of dysphagia in patients with cerebral palsy: the conclusion of the authors is that sEMG may be useful in the diagnosis of OPD. Evaluation of OPD due to brainstem stroke by sEMG was already reported, but this paper is the first to assess sEMG as a screening tool in cerebral palsy b. The issue considering sEMG simpler, faster, and at lower cost than video fluoroscopic study is questionable and should be confirmed in further studies. c. Apart these concerns, sEMG may indeed be proposed as a tool to screen patients with possible OPD but the doubts if this will be a sufficient assessment and if patients will need further diagnostic procedures to confirm the diagnosis, may reduce its cost-benefit. (2) Presentation and readability a. The paper is well presented and written in a good English (3) Ethics of the research a. No concerns about ethical issues **SPECIFIC COMMENTS**

Title: It reflects contents of the study. **Abstract:** It gives a clear explanation of the research. **Materials and methods:** A detailed description of the methods and of the statistical evaluation is provided. There are concerns about the small sample size and about the control group, as stated by the authors in the paragraph regarding limitations of the study. **Results:** The results provide sufficient evidence or data to draw the conclusion of the authors. A description of the fluoroscopic evaluation that has been performed in all patients of the study and a comparison with sEMG (may be in a table) would give more strength to the study. A detailed report of dysphagia score of patients with OPD would be quite helpful. Presumably this group is not homogeneous from this point of view and likely sEMG could be more reliable in some subgroups. With a sensitivity rate of 85% and positive predictive value of 73.9% it may be doubtful to consider sEMG as the gold standard for the diagnosis of OPD. Discussion: Well organized. Conclusions are acceptable. See above References: References are appropriate and updated. Tables and figures: Tables concerning fluoroscopy and dysphagia scores would be welcomed