



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15236

Title: "Improved Specimen Adequacy Using Jumbo Biopsy Forceps in Patients with Barrett's Esophagus"

Reviewer's code: 02906602

Reviewer's country: Sweden

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-11-17 13:46

Date reviewed: 2014-11-26 16:20

Table with 4 columns: CLASSIFICATION, LANGUAGE EVALUATION, SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT, CONCLUSION. It contains checkboxes for various evaluation criteria like 'Grade A: Excellent', 'Duplicate publication', 'Plagiarism', etc.

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read with interest the article of Marinek et al comparing 4 different forceps for retrieving biopsies from patients with Barrett's oesophagus. The study appears to be well designed and conducted, and the article is clearly presented. I do have a few comments and questions: - If the 4 forceps were used in a random order, and the number of biopsies per forceps were determined beforehand, the number of biopsies should be more similar I would expect? (range 92-121 for the 4 different forceps) - Why did the authors decide not to report % in the result section? This could describe the results more accurately than "two thirds of biopsies ...", "significantly bigger specimen" etc. - How many samples were taken on average from each patient, or what is the range approximately? - The biopsies are taken by two physicians. Do they have the same level of experience? Is this a procedure with a learning curve, or does it require some time to get used to the different forceps? This may explain the differences with previous studies, if the physicians in the present study are really experienced? - The authors mention in the discussion that they have a high proportion of IEN. Please describe (roughly) the proportion in other studies/settings to put this number in perspective. - Are the specimens



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>

evaluated by both pathologists, or only 1? Could this have influenced the interpretation of the results?
- Could it be that there is a calculation error in Table 2, for the diagnostic yield in the total group?
Shouldn't it be $(91+13)/436=0.24$ instead of 0.26?