

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8357

Title: Interaction between Pork Consumption, CagA Status and IL1B-31 Genotypes in Gastric Cancer-

Reviewer code: 00538725

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-12-27 10:12

Date reviewed: 2013-12-30 15:34

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)	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Is there any evidence to classify the pork consumption in high or low level by 25g per day? Why not use quartile to analyze the dose response? The conclusion in the abstract isn't informative.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8357

Title: Interaction between Pork Consumption, CagA Status and IL1B-31 Genotypes in Gastric Cancer-

Reviewer code: 00048752

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-12-27 10:12

Date reviewed: 2014-01-06 10:16

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is a logical extension of their previous paper (reference 29). They have divided samples into high/low consumption of Pork, and have got positive interaction between gastric cancer and IL1B31 C carrier in HP CAG positive and high pork consumption group. Major It is plausible to imagine that nutritional levels may be different between high/low pork consumption groups. The average BMI level between both groups should be described. The discussion section is long and includes matters that are not directly related to their findings. The discussion section should be truncated to 50-65%. The patients and control potentially include those who have successfully received HP eradication. If so, this information, including the ratio of HP eradication, should be described. Minor I guess that they have initially selected GC and HP positive people and control HP positive people. If so, the description of "HP positive" should be described. The description of education level in Table 1 is confusing and needs explanation. In table 2, The description of HP(-) and HP(+) may lead to misunderstanding because HP antibody positive and HP CAG antibody positive are different.