



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 46401

**Title:** Alteration of the esophageal microbiota in Barrett's esophagus and esophageal adenocarcinoma

**Reviewer's code:** 02440843

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-02-19 18:22

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-02-24 22:28

**Review time:** 5 Days and 4 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is a very well written and extremely informative state of the art review on a topic that has not received much attention in the medical literature. My suggestions are as follows: The information is very well presented. Since it is narrative form only, the



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

reader may find it hard to remember the important details. I would advise the addition of several tables, such as important organisms as mentioned in the text as well as listing mechanisms as listed in the text. In conjunction with these, I advise the addition of figures that demonstrate some of the important mechanisms that are outlined in the text. These will greatly enhance the quality and future importance of the manuscript.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 46401

**Title:** Alteration of the esophageal microbiota in Barrett's esophagus and esophageal adenocarcinoma

**Reviewer's code:** 02549032

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-03-06 11:37

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-03-14 18:16

**Review time:** 8 Days and 6 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is an interesting review opinion on esophageal microbiota in barrett esophagus (BE) and esophageal adenocarcinoma (EAC). The authors reviewed large number of articles (90 articles) and concluded that esophageal microbiota <<might play a causative role in



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

the pathogenesis of BE/EAC>>. Some issues to be answered: 1. No detailed methodology for this review is described. Particularly how they have chosen the relative articles, (pubmed research? Only fullpapers? Etc). 2. The authors stated that <<Esophageal adenocarcinoma (EAC) is a common malignancy>>. I don't agree because in Asian countries squamous esophageal carcinoma is more common. EAC is generally not common but increasing in incidence. 3. The authors stated that based on their review: << ..microbiota, and dysbiosis may be related to BE/EAC.>>. However, this conclusion is not absolutely correct. The <<cause/ effect>> relation of microbiota and cancer, which is multifactorial disease, is difficult to be proved and cannot be based on weak, questionable studies. It is not clear if alterations in microbiota is a cause of BE or a result of BE, which resembles to intestinal mucosa (metaplasia). 4. It is generalized and not specific for BE or EAC to say that inflammatory parameters might be implicated in carcinogenesis. Why in BE and not in other organs? 5. In any way alterations in microbiota in BE, EAC, cannot prove the cause- relation to BE or EAC. More data on this issue is necessary and is too difficult because of large heterogeneity of such kind of studies. 6. The most important issue in BE/Esophageal adenocarcinoma is the low incidence of BE/EAC in Asia v/s high incidence in West. Is this difference related to differences in esophageal microbiota? 7. There is no clear evidence that features of esophageal microbial communities in BE and EAC patients, may promote the development of BE and EAC.>> So please re-write this conclusion in more accurate way. 8. The authors reported on isolated studies < Macfarlane S et al. found that Campylobacter species colonized esophagus in the majority of BE patients and could not be identified in other groups>>. << Amir I et al. strongly suggested that the family Enterobacteriaceae (mainly the genus Escherichia) is associated with esophageal abnormalities, such as esophagitis and BE, ..>> However the <<cause and effect>> relationship cannot be proved. It is questionable to make definite conclusions based on



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

isolated studies. It should be rewritten the message.

#### INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

##### *Google Search:*

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### *BPG Search:*

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No