



# Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 9158

**Title:** Heartburn and regurgitation have different impacts on life quality of patients with gastroesophageal reflux disease

**Reviewer code:** 02438173

**Science editor:** Ma,Na

**Date sent for review:** 2014-02-14 01:09

**Date reviewed:** 2014-02-15 12:04

| 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 checked="" 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 authors, Your study is very interesting. However, it is sometimes difficult to divide the patients clinically into 2 groups as you did because lots of patients have both symptoms, maybe at the same time or not. Since your study has unexpected results, you are supposed to analyze them, review more references and discuss their possible causes. For instance, in Figure 4, why the scores of NERD and EE of Regurgitation group are almost the same in PH, but different in MH? In addition, could the factor of female dominance in the group of Regurgitation/NERD influence the result? I will suggest you to do more to enrich your discussion!



# Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 9158

**Title:** Heartburn and regurgitation have different impacts on life quality of patients with gastroesophageal reflux disease

**Reviewer code:** 00034127

**Science editor:** Ma,Na

**Date sent for review:** 2014-02-14 01:09

**Date reviewed:** 2014-03-11 11:14

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting original manuscript assessing the impact of heartburn and regurgitation on quality of life in GERD patients. Comments: 1. According to DIAMOND study diagnosis of GERD based on questionnaire has only moderate sensitivity and specificity (Gut 2010;59:714-21). The Authors used upper endoscopy to identify patients with erosive esophagitis. However the Authors did not use esophageal pH or impedance-pH testing to determine whether patients without esophagitis had symptoms related to acid reflux. Therefore the Authors may not have excluded patients with functional heartburn. I would recommend to address this significant limitations. Further references include: GASTROENTEROLOGY 2006;130:1459 -1465, Dis Esophagus. 2013 Nov-Dec;26(8):755-65. 2. Were the patients only adults (please specify the minimal age). 3. Was it prospective study or retrospective study of previously collected data? 4. Was endoscopy done by the same provider? 5. Please clarify the conclusion: The Authors state that heartburn had more negative impact on daily activity in daily living when compared to regurgitation. Then the Authors state that regurgitation had more negative impact on daily activities in GERD patients than heartburn. predominant. Did heartburn have more negative impact on daily activities than regurgitation in EE patients? Such conclusion might be drawn from the first statement in the conclusion. It has to be clarified.



# Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 9158

**Title:** Heartburn and regurgitation have different impacts on life quality of patients with gastroesophageal reflux disease

**Reviewer code:** 00158526

**Science editor:** Ma,Na

**Date sent for review:** 2014-02-14 01:09

**Date reviewed:** 2014-03-12 01:28

| 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)            | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing  | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor) |   | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Review for the manuscript No:9158 Heartburn and regurgitation have different impacts on life quality of patients with gastroesophageal reflux disease General comments: Though the authors have made a substantial effort to introduce their work about the quality of life of GERD patients I conclude that in the study protocol are two major problems. The study is retrospective. In addition, the patients are selected only from those who stayed in the hospital and have usually more than one disease and are not ordinary uncomplicated patients with GER symptoms. I propose that the authors perform a similar prospective study in the near future and include representative sample of the general population. Specific Comments: they probably missed a lot of patients with functional problems, because pH-impedance was not performed. Discussion: Is well organized. References: Are appropriate, relevant, and updated. Tables and figures: Are appropriate, well structured. According to the language evaluation the revised article is evaluated as grade B.