

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4622

Title: Systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials: Proton pump inhibitor against non-erosive reflux disease

Reviewer code: 00503535

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-07-11 10:09

Date reviewed: 2013-07-27 15:01

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"/> Existed	<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)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript, the authors review the efficacy, safety and their influential factors of proton pump inhibitor (PPI) against non-erosive reflux disease (NERD). It is well written and very interesting, therefore, the reviewer considered that no serious problems were found, however, some questions have been raised as follows. 1. In the discussion session, the authors should discuss the reasons why the overall rate of symptomatic relief of PPI against NERD was influenced by hiatal hernia, and the adverse rate of PPI against NERD was effected by hiatal hernia and drinking. 2. In the abstract, the authors do not recommend PPI for NERD with hiatal hernia. The reviewer thinks that's putting it a little too strongly. 3. In some figures, it is hard to read small print.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4622

Title: Systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials: Proton pump inhibitor against non-erosive reflux disease

Reviewer code: 00069819

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-07-11 10:09

Date reviewed: 2013-08-10 01:18

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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input checked="" 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)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is sufficiently interesting and original. I have the following comments/suggestions: 1. The title should be changed to : Proton pump inhibitors for non-erosive reflux disease: A meta-analysis. 2. The introduction is too long. 3. The discussion section should be more exhaustive. Furthermore, this section should begin by briefly stating the results and their significance. 4. The references to review for such meta-analysis should be at least 50-60!

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4622

Title: Systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials: Proton pump inhibitor against non-erosive reflux disease

Reviewer code: 00051367

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-07-11 10:09

Date reviewed: 2013-07-17 14:18

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"/> Existed	<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)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper does not really add anymore to the matter.