

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5378

Title: Gastric Atrophy and Intestinal Metaplasia changes of gastric mucosa before and after helicobacter pylori eradication: a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 00012499

Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan

Date sent for review: 2013-09-05 08:20

Date reviewed: 2013-10-15 22:43

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)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input 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 a nice meta-analysis, but in its present form the paper is hard to read due to the figures and tables being mixed with the text (at times it is hard to separate text from figure legends), figures being not presented in order, unexplained abbreviations in the abstract, the meaning of histology scores not being introduced, and sections of poor English. Specific comments: Title: Shorten to "Histological changes of gastric....meta-analysis". Abstract: Explain WMD and mention histological scores in results. Reduce the statistical detail. Introduction: line 4 replace standing by a less vague term such as cure rates. Insert a paragraph explaining histology scores (here and/or under methods). Methods: shorten "statistical analysis". Results, characteristics of included studies: replace different parts of the world by "mostly Japan and Italy". Continue: "All the papers gave data for up to fourantrum." Delete the next sentence. Histologic parameters: The first paragraph deals with data extraction and the next paragraph is unclear. Which result in Fig.3 showed no significant difference? It looks to me that many ones do not when considered separately! Please re-label figures or do not refer to fig 6 and fig 3 here. Discussion, third paragraph: mine>the present study. Last sentence: unclear.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5378

Title: Gastric Atrophy and Intestinal Metaplasia changes of gastric mucosa before and after helicobacter pylori eradication: a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 00061678

Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan

Date sent for review: 2013-09-05 08:20

Date reviewed: 2013-10-20 02:00

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 checked="" 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

Dear Editor Thanks for sending the manuscript "Gastric atrophy and Intestinal Metaplasia Changes of Gastric Mucosa before and after Helicobacter pylori Eradication: a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis". Please accept the following comments: - It is considered frequently repeated idea, no novelty. - It is easy idea that can be done in a prospective idea - few spelling and grammar mistakes. - well organised writing thanks.