



# 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

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5414

Title: Sham Peer Review in Clinical Practice

Reviewer code: 02675422

Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan

Date sent for review: 2013-09-06 18:33

Date reviewed: 2013-09-17 00:53

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"/> 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)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript addresses an important topic and opens up a discussion regarding reform of clinician peer review. The background sections need to be revised to clarify the issues for readers who are not familiar with the issue. One problem is that the nature of peer review needs further clarification. The authors note that peer review is required for regulatory purposes, but also indicate that peer review can be initiated in response to a perceived problem with the an individual physician's practice (e.g. the case of Susan Meyer, described in the paper). It would be helpful to clearly distinguish between these two situations. For example, the authors state on page 1 that most peer review occurs through retrospective chart reviews, but also that practices vary widely. Are there also random checks of specific physicians in which particular cases are examined more closely, or is this kind of review only initiated in response to a reported problem? Related to this, is it the fact of being the subject of peer review that is damaging to physicians, or must the findings of peer review be distorted in such a way as to discredit the subject of the review? To put the question slightly differently, would it be possible for a physician to be reviewed and come out of the review with an excellent assessment - and therefore have their reputation enhanced? It seems that the problem raised by Patrick vs. Burget is both that the review was not warranted on the basis of Dr. Patrick's practice and that the Chair of the review committee had a clear conflict of interest. If the latter could be dealt with, then there would be much less reason to fear even reviews that are initiated maliciously. Also, please clarify the relationship between the description of the Meyer and Bender cases and the "sham" peer review. The cases describe problems with the peer review process that are clearly related to the immunity of the review committee, but their link to shame peer review needs to be made explicit.



# 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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 5414

**Title:** Sham Peer Review in Clinical Practice

**Reviewer code:** 02446043

**Science editor:** Ma, Ya-Juan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-09-06 18:33

**Date reviewed:** 2013-10-04 22:34

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" 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)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

An interesting paper worthy of publication. However, authors should: i) modify title so that it is clear authors are writing about the history, legal development and subsequent abuse of the requirement for medical doctors to review each others' clinical practice in the United States. ii) delete reference to forthcoming articles in the first line of abstract, since there is no elaboration on such a series in body of the article.