

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12572

Title: New aspects in the pathomechanism and diagnosis of LPR - Clinical impact of laryngeal proton pumps and pharyngeal pH metry in extraesophageal GERD

Reviewer code: 02444953

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-07-16 18:58

Date reviewed: 2014-07-22 17:15

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is a well written study about new aspects of LPR. The study is well designed and the diverse results are well discussed. The authors should state that both examinations are performed during the same time period and should list the results of the individual scores of deMeesters, Ryan score and des SAP score (individual symptom score). Whre the any correlation of LPR and impedance measures? The should also state the pH scale for indicating reflux in the esophagus and pharynx. If there is a difference they should explain this and correlate this to their results. I think this paper should be accepted after minor revision.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12572

Title: New aspects in the pathomechanism and diagnosis of LPR – Clinical impact of laryngeal proton pumps and pharyngeal pH metry in extraesophageal GERD

Reviewer code: 02442330

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-07-16 18:58

Date reviewed: 2014-07-31 21:09

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments: Ad figure 1: the therapy response (bar) should be included in the bars of the diagnostic procedures. Ad discussion, H+K+ATPase: The authors state that laryngeal H+K+ATPase proton pumps are very unlikely the cause of LPR symptoms due to detection in only two LPR patients. However, in the former paragraph the authors state that the low detection rate can be the result of an endoscopic sampling error. The authors should discuss that both patients with detection of laryngeal H+K+ATPase proton pumps responded to PPI therapy. The authors can be congratulated for investigating systematically the role of the Dx-pH probe in LPR patients. It seems that the Dx-pH probe and pH/MII are measuring different phenomena (Ummarino D, Laryngoscope 2013;123:980-4; Becker V, J Gastrointest Surg 2012;16:1096-101). The authors should discuss that all nine patients who responded to PPI therapy were Dx pH positive (9 out of 14 Dx pH positive patients responded to PPI therapy). How many patients who responded to PPI therapy were pH/MII positive is not stated in the manuscript. Minor comments: Ad "Patients and Results", last paragraph: The last sentence must be included in the next-to-last paragraph or omitted.