



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 14420

Title: The fate of meta-analyses: the case of *Helicobacter pylori*

Reviewer code: 02460731

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-10-06 18:43

Date reviewed: 2014-10-09 03:40

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper is not a meta-analytic approach to the problem. Is a simple description of literature en relation to *Helicobacter Pylori*. This papeer must be directer to other journal.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 14420

Title: The fate of meta-analyses: the case of *Helicobacter pylori*

Reviewer code: 00183471

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-10-06 18:43

Date reviewed: 2014-10-07 16:49

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"/> Existing	<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"/> 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

1. Language needs corrections at many places as in the heading of Historical background; line -7 "effect of typhoid fever inoculation in volunteers" not clear. 2. Inclusion of meta-analysis in consensus statements; line -6 the meaning of "identic" is not clear.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 14420

Title: The fate of meta-analyses: the case of *Helicobacter pylori*

Reviewer code: 02455519

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-10-06 18:43

Date reviewed: 2014-10-21 07:08

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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<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

No comments.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 14420

Title: The fate of meta-analyses: the case of Helicobacter pylori

Reviewer code: 02467561

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-10-06 18:43

Date reviewed: 2014-10-21 17:10

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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<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

GENERAL COMMENTS: The manuscript "The fate of meta-analyses: the case of Helicobacter pylori" is very interesting and original in its contents. Nevertheless, in my opinion, it shows some critical points to be addressed reported as follows. **SPECIFIC COMMENTS:** **MAJOR REVISIONS ?**

Introduction o Only the general objective of the study is reported. The specific objectives should also be specified. ? **Historical background** o The Author states: "For reasons unknown to the author, there are no mega-trials on H. pylori including thousands of patients as in the case of hypertension, diabetes or hyperlipidemia treatment: this assessing the heterogeneity of the included studies and then selection of adequate statistical methods are of pivotal importance". I don't understand what this paragraph is trying to say. I think I can infer what the Author means, but it would be better if this paragraph was more clearly written. ? **The fate of meta-analyses in Helicobacter pylori research** o In my view, this section is likely to sound piecemeal and it could be better organized by not mixing methods, results and conclusions, but bringing them in separate paragraphs of the same section. Moreover, methods should be described in more detail (number of meta-analyses on selected topics, topic of meta-analyses on Helicobacter pylori, core journals publishing meta-analyses and systematic reviews on Helicobacter pylori). Finally, it should be explained what is meant by "core journals". ? **Inclusion of meta-analyses in the consensus statements** o The comments above also apply to this section. It could be better organized and written. **MINOR REVISIONS ?** **Author contribution** "ana " is misspelled (and the manuscript's



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

pages should be numbered). ? Introduction “accesed” and “overreview” are misspelled. ? Historical background “acesible” is misspelled. On line 20, the comma after “It became clear” should be removed. On line 23, a dot should be inserted after “...publication bias, etc)”. ? The fate of meta-analyses in *Helicobacter pylori* research On line 23, after “gastrointestinal diseases” the space before the dot should be deleted. Which is the number of meta-analyses on *Helicobacter pylori* found (351 or 352?). Please, check and correct. I would suggest the Author to carefully read back the paper in order to correct the above mentioned and other misprints throughout the text.