ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4974

Title: The effectiveness of IGRAs for differentiation of intestinal tuberculosis from Crohn's disease in Asia : A systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 00504182

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-08-06 21:43

Date reviewed: 2013-08-10 21:47

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C (Good)	[Y] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[Y] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I suggest to underline also the importance of the IGRAs assay as far as tuberculosis flare from a primary pulmonary complex during immunosuppressant therapy in Crohn's disease. Therefore the manuscript must be reviewed. Also the English language and expressions should have a very rigorous review process.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4974

Title: The effectiveness of IGRAs for differentiation of intestinal tuberculosis from Crohn's disease in Asia : A systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 00071779

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-08-06 21:43

Date reviewed: 2013-08-25 14:18

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[Y] High priority for
[Y] Grade C (Good)	[Y] Grade C: a great deal of	[ ] No records	publication
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A good effort. Some more language corrections required.

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 4974
Title: The effectiveness of IGRAs for differentiation of intestinal tuberculosis from Crohn's disease in Asia : A systematic review and meta-analysis
Reviewer code: 00031838
Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin
Date sent for review: 2013-08-06 21:43
Date reviewed: 2013-08-28 21:47

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	
[ ] Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[Y] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting meta-analysis   Comments: 1. Title - would remove "in Asia" from title, as you did not plan to look at only papers from Asia. 2. Methods - why were only English language abstracts searched? If this is a common topic in Asia, then excluding non-English papers may leave relevant papers out. You need to state what your inclusion criteria were for the gold standard against which each test was compared. You have included papers that have different standards for a diagnosis of intestinal TB. 3. Data Extraction - Placing scalar grids over plots needs a reference to confirm its validity as an approach.   4. Statistics - why was a random-effects model used if there is heterogeneity amongst the studies? 5. Results - need to give a reason why 8 studies were excluded based on their contents (in a separate Table). You should perform sensitivity analysis if only the studies that used histological or microbiological confirmation of ITB are included. Does this change the SROC? Publication Bias - Egger tests are not useful if less than 10 studies are included, as in this case. 6. Discussion - is too long, no need to reiterate the background literature on this topic, just your conclusions.   You mention a review of non-English language studies "results were similar", but that is not appropriate for a systematic review; if there were eligible non-English language studies you should include them.   Limitations of SROC curves should be provided.