

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18234

Title: Oral Cavity is Second Colonized Site Beside Stomach, - a milestone discovery

Reviewer's code: 03009633

Reviewer's country: Poland

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-04-15 09:43

Date reviewed: 2015-05-07 21:08

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 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 checked="" 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

The manuscript entitled: Oral Cavity is Second Colonized Site Beside Stomach- a milestone discovery is interesting and bring some new aspects in this field. In recent years there have been many concerns about the presence of H. pylori in oral cavity as well as the role of H. pylori reservoir in oral cavity in the pathogenesis and the course of H. pylori infection in human stomach. That is why the manuscript deserves attention The work represents a review paper. Here are my comments concerning the paper: Abstract: The authors presents the study aims and the rationale of the study are well specified. In the section "The proposed idea contradicts with PCR studies" the authors presents the same ideas as in the section "It contradicts with the fact of patients with Oral H. pylori positive and are UBT negative" It would better to correct this sections. There is no summary in the manuscript in which the authors drew the conclusions from the presented aspects of H. pylori infection. It would be better to present the conclusions more clearly. The language of the manuscript should be improved. A mistypings are noticed in the sections: introduction: "reflex" instead of reflux, And in the section about treatment: infective instead of ineffective. References: updated, well selected Formally, the manuscript requires some minor revision. Language and sentence construction should be improved.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18234

Title: Oral Cavity is Second Colonized Site Beside Stomach, - a milestone discovery

Reviewer's code: 03009232

Reviewer's country: Poland

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-04-15 09:43

Date reviewed: 2015-05-08 20:22

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

The manuscript concerns interesting problem of persistence of *H. pylori* in oral cavity. The author reviews available literature and tries to propose some new guidelines for dealing with *H. pylori* infections. In my opinion the manuscript requires some editorial work before publishing. The author decided to compose the text in a way to point out contradictions of the idea specified in the initial part of the manuscript. Such composition is confusing, because it is difficult to clearly see what is contradicted in subsequent parts of the text. Some introduction included in each point would make it much more clear, especially that in current form the manuscript seems to be an assembly of several independent parts instead of one entire text. The lack of introduction is very clear in the part regarding the status of high drug resistance. There is no clear transition from the description of the research of oral *H. pylori* and the description techniques useful in detection of oral *H. pylori*. The author has entitled that later section as "The foundation..." which also seems to be a bit confusing. The manuscript also lacks the final conclusions section, which in my opinion is necessary. What is the origin of data shown in the graphs? I can assume that graphs have been created on the basis of publications cited in the text, nevertheless such information should also be included in the captions of



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>

figures (for example: “base on...” or “adapted from...”). There are numerous language errors across the entire text, including grammar errors as well as inappropriate compositions of sequences. Therefore it is very difficult to understand some parts of the manuscript. The author should also carefully check formatting of the text, especially when names of genes or bacteria are used (lack of italics).