

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15435

Title: Quantitative Image Analysis of Celiac Disease

Reviewer's code: 03000567

Reviewer's country: Iran

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-11-26 09:23

Date reviewed: 2014-12-11 15:52

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | PubMed Search: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | [Y] No | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | BPG Search: | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | [Y] No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Is it a beginning for automated diagnosis of CD? The Quantitative Image Analysis of Celiac Disease is, in my opinion, a gripping blend of this project. In this Editorial, Authors nicely complied their previous experiments in comparing Video Capsule Endoscopy and histopathology findings in CD progressively. In addition to be a single center experience, lack of cases in each study has been limited the results. Another important problem is the villous atrophy due to another disease that needs further descriptions.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15435

Title: Quantitative Image Analysis of Celiac Disease

Reviewer's code: 00504545

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-11-26 09:23

Date reviewed: 2014-11-26 15:44

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | PubMed Search: | <input checked="" 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 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 | | [Y] No | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | BPG Search: | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | [Y] No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an excellent review paper about the actual and future methods and possibilities to take measurements of the intestinal lesions in CD patients. Congratulations for their broad description

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15435

Title: Quantitative Image Analysis of Celiac Disease

Reviewer's code: 00186136

Reviewer's country: Brazil

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-11-26 09:23

Date reviewed: 2014-11-26 18:42

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | PubMed Search: | <input checked="" 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 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 | | [Y] No | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | BPG Search: | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | [Y] No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very interesting discussion on currently used quantitative techniques and suggestions on directions for improving such techniques.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15435

Title: Quantitative Image Analysis of Celiac Disease

Reviewer's code: 03009230

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-11-26 09:23

Date reviewed: 2014-11-27 20:36

| 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 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"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | 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

Overall an excellent review into an up and coming area. I have a few points The authors talk about capsule endoscopy and computed evaluation of capsule images. It is not clear from the manuscript which of the cited studies are looking into capsule images and which are analysing conventional endoscopic images. We need to make sure this distinction is clear. The authors haven't discussed the problems of confirming apparent villous atrophy changes on capsule endoscopy - ie not reached with standard endoscopy. The authors could briefly discuss the use of enhanced endoscopy - NBI, I-scan, magnification and the like.