

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 20533

Title: Antireflux surgery vs medical treatment for gastroesophageal reflux disease: A meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 03254314

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-06-11 14:12

Date reviewed: 2015-07-12 20:18

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | <input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade C: Good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | <input type="checkbox"/> [] Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No | <input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a good job, up to date results of medical and surgical treatment of gastroesophageal reflux

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 20533

Title: Antireflux surgery vs medical treatment for gastroesophageal reflux disease: A meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00189256

Reviewer's country: Ukraine

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-06-11 14:12

Date reviewed: 2015-07-08 21:41

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | 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"/> The same title | <input checked="" 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"/> Duplicate publication | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

You have prepared an article devoted to the urgent problem of clinical gastroenterology. The material is presented and correctly. Meta-analysis of the 7 randomized clinical trials is adequate to the research problems and the aim.