

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 13231

Title: Incidence and Psychological-Behavioral Characteristics of Refractory Functional Dyspepsia: A Large, Multi-Center, Prospective Investigation from China

Reviewer code: 01800334

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-08-13 20:07

Date reviewed: 2014-08-29 11:25

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"/> Existing	<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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would like to confirm if the word "refractory FD" that was defined newly in this manuscript is acceptable for authors. I guess the RFD patients do not necessarily mean refractory process because the definition "RFD" comes from only one characteristics that at least 2 medical interventions did not improve the symptoms as they defined. In fact, RFD had longer duration when compared with non RFD as seen in Table 2. This paper may just demonstrate that longer duration of FD may have a severer clinical characteristics. Therefore, I am wondering whether the term "refractory FD" should be allowed.