

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 13417

**Title:** Psychosocial Mechanisms for the Transmission of Somatic Symptoms from Parents to Children

**Reviewer code:** 02489616

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2014-08-23 17:45

**Date reviewed:** 2014-08-31 14:11

| CLASSIFICATION                                    | LANGUAGE EVALUATION   | RECOMMENDATION                      | 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"/> Existing   | <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            | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected                            | BPG Search:                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor            |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision     |
|   |   | <input type="checkbox"/> No records |  |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting article looking at the relationship between maternal and child somatic symptoms in the setting of IBS. There are some clarity issues that need to be addressed to make it a much better manuscript. Abstract: The aim needs to be rewritten - it is not clear at all what the study is about from your aim - there is no mention of IBS; "explain familial aggregation (of what?!) Similarly, you mention your hypotheses in the methods section. The "cold symptoms" in hypothesis 1 seems to come from nowhere. Also, there are a few typos and one instance where the font changes "Child Symptom Checklist (Gastrointestinal symptoms). Also, with p, r and rho values (this applies throughout the manuscript) it is easier to read if the 0 is included prior to 0.01 for example. Main manuscript: Introduction: Aim and hypothesis - the aim is clear, but the hypothesis are only referred to obliquely, which means that it is very confusing when you get to the methods and are treated to hypotheses 1-4. These should be mentioned in the introduction first. From you "aim" paragraph it seems like your first hypotheses is that "transmission of of mother to child is specific for GI symptoms but (not) other symptoms such as cold symptoms" and the second hypothesis is related to the risk factors of transmission. Methods: Please explain Rome Criteria 1 briefly in the text. Child and parent measures: You report validity and reliability for some of the measures (e.g. FILE) but not all (e.g. ARCS, PI, CBCL). Similarly you report questions for some (ARCS) but not all. Is there a reason for this? (3) CSCL - you mention that you added in 7 URTI symptoms - but not which ones,



## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

or where they came from, or how you validated or chose them. RESULTS: Sometimes you report p values as  $<0.05$ , and other times you give the p value. Do you have the actual p value that you can report? Eg 0.049 is very different to 0.001, and would lead to better interpretation of results. Last sentence - reads that age correlates with non GI symptoms and moms IBS severity - when I think there are two separate points here? Also, suggest maternal or mother's rather than mom's. Figure 1: Please include the p values on the figure for each variable to aid in interpretation. Discussion: I would be interested to know how your modelling results and your reinforcement of illness behaviour results fit in with previous studies? Study limitations: Having a control group of mothers that are older and more educated than the cases is a limitation (even though one you have controlled for.) Conclusion: Few typos in the second sentence. Also think that as the relationship between cognition and coping strategies was essentially negative (with the exception of the negative correlation between maternal passive coping straggles and child symptom reporting) - the conclusion about catastrophizing is a little out of left field?