

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17449

Title: Helicobacter pylori and gastric mucin expression – A systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 03261349

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-03-11 17:33

Date reviewed: 2015-03-19 17:36

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper by Niv entitled "Helicobacter pylori and gastric mucin expression – A systematic review and meta-analysis" is a meta-analysis showing relationship between H. pylori infection and levels of gastric mucins expression. Main comments: ? A minor linguistic revision could be useful. ? A figure illustrating the process of study selection is lacking. When reporting a meta-analysis, a model that adheres to "PRISMA" criteria should be adopted. ? There is no mention of heterogeneity between studies. The chi square test and the I2 statistic should be calculated. This is fundamental for the choice between random or fixed-effects model. ? It is not reported whether a random or a fixed-effects model has been adopted. ? The author should cite the employed software (i.e. Comprehensive meta-analysis TM), and not the its corresponding website.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17449

Title: Helicobacter pylori and gastric mucin expression – A systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 03017395

Reviewer's country: Israel

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-03-11 17:33

Date reviewed: 2015-03-26 03:17

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Niv presents a well-constructed meta-analysis of studies assessing the effect of Hp on gastric mucin secretion. This study is makes sense of the contradictory results in the literature. 1. minor english language polishing is needed. for example "adopted" in the intro should be "adapted". also "active action" is sloppy. more examples can be found throughout. 2. information regarding heterogeneity is lacking (I2) 3.I would like more information regarding how mucin secretion was quantified. this appears only briefly in the methods section, and should be expanded. Furthermore, it should be stated that all studies included in the MA were controlled. (A CONSORT diagram would be useful.) 4. details for the statistical methods as well as software (rather than a website) should be provided. 5. the forest plots should indicated "increased MUC5AC" or decreased MUC5AC, instead of "favours A/B", for example. 6. The discussion is excellent. Niv elegantly provides a physiological basis for the results observed. Overall well written. Should be published.