

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4960

Title: Stretta: Seven key questions on a valuable endoscopic treatment modality for chronic GERD

Reviewer code: 00073423

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-08-06 09:34

Date reviewed: 2013-08-06 19:59

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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The amount of patients with refractory-GERD or partially refractory GERD is increasing. Therefore the need for some improved or complex approach to the treatment of GERD is emerging. The comprehensive analysis of STRETTA procedure is presented in the paper. The data are well and clearly presented, it is easy to read and understand, the data are interesting and informative. Nevertheless, I have some comments: 1. The majority of studies are small and not randomized? The results of studies are though positive for Stretta, but not overwhelming? It looks as these studies were influenced by industry? Industry-bias? 2. There are no negative studies presented? Publication bias? 3. The procedure investigated and studies performed only in some regions (mainly North America), and in experienced, well equipped endoscopic centers? 4. The safety issues are not completely clarified? The mortality seems to be unacceptable performing such a procedure? The benefit-risk ratio must be discussed? 5. Mechanism of action remains also not fully clarified? 6. Long-term results (5 years) of well-designed studies are not available