

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16041

**Title:** Effect of clinician-patient communication on compliance with flupentixol-melitracen in functional dyspepsia patients

**Reviewer's code:** 00068583

**Reviewer's country:** Estonia

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2014-12-23 11:33

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-31 02:50

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a nicely designed study to assess the treatment effects of Functional dyspepsia using 4 different approaches. The study was appropriately performed, the study interventions are described, the comparisons of outcome measures between groups adequately described.

I have the following remarks and questions:

1. In the title and aims defined in the abstract it is said that different communicational strategies were used. On p.4 and p. 10 (conclusions) it is stated that the effect of appropriate clinician-patient communication was investigated. Actually there is no communication strategy described in the methods, the difference between groups was in the amount and kind of information that was provided to the patients. Therefore please define once again the aim of the work and use appropriate wording in writing the aim, title and conclusion.
2. In general, the results of the study could be guessed as there have been similar studies demonstrating the additional effect of providing more information to have better outcome.



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

What is new in this study? Why the study was undertaken? What is its importance to the international readership?

3. Please discuss similarities/differences between compliance and adherence, both of these terms have been used in your manuscript.
4. Why severe psychological symptoms was used as an exclusion criteria (p.4)?
5. Why lower educational level was excluded?
6. The possible effects of dietary advice and just assurance by doctors have been left out of attention- why? It is widely accepted tht both of these aspects have a major influence on symptoms of functional dyspepsia.
7. Tables and figures should be self-explaining, table 2 should have a more exact title.



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16041

**Title:** Effect of clinician-patient communication on compliance with flupentixol-melitracen in functional dyspepsia patients

**Reviewer's code:** 03009754

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2014-12-23 11:33

**Date reviewed:** 2015-01-05 02:15

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Although there are similar studies related to functional dyspepsia and study results can be predictable, this study was designed well and conducted.