

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11566

Title: Snapshot of an Integrated Psychosocial Gastroenterology Service

Reviewer code: 00069819

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-05-28 20:12

Date reviewed: 2014-05-30 02:03

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" 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"/> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting study of the feasibility and effect of psychological interventions in the management of common GI disorders. The manuscript is well written, the tables are well organized, and the results are outlined in a very effective manner. The discussion is adequate, with the limitations of the study stated clearly by the Authors. My only comments/suggestions are the following: 1. In the abstract, the abbreviation "CBT" should be preceded by the full terminology, "Cognitive Behavioral Therapy". 2. The introduction should be shortened. I believe that this article, if published, will attract a significant number of readers, especially from among gastroenterologists with specific interest in functional GI disorders.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11566

Title: Snapshot of an Integrated Psychosocial Gastroenterology Service

Reviewer code: 00503587

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-05-28 20:12

Date reviewed: 2014-06-10 15:24

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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript describes the outcomes of a behavioural medicine service. Specific Comments: 1. The ABSTRACT covers the work well. However, the last sentence should be revised. One suspects that the patients may have been "dysfunctional" rather than functional: this sentence would read better as "patients with GI functional disorders" 2. Compliment in the INTRODUCTION should be complement 3. The final sentence of the INTRODUCTION should read " The goal of the current study was to..." 4. The second and fifth sentences of the RESULTS section should not begin with numbers 5.It is unclear, during reading the RESULTS section, how many patients were in each subgroup. The number of patients with functional bowel disorders appears to be listed as 199 and 43. The authors could carefully review the RESULTS section to enhance flow and readability. Furthermore, do the outcomes listed relate to just those patients with s functional bowel disorder or to all those who were treated? 6. Table 2 has a very brief legend that could be more comprehensive (meaning that the table is more independent from the text). Also, the lines do not match up on my version, and the other group should be detailed here.