

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18193

Title: Helicobacter pylori and colorectal neoplasia: Is there a causal link?

Reviewer's code: 00057996

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2015-04-11 12:53

Date reviewed: 2015-04-27 21:01

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 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

Vasilios Papastergiou and colleagues presented with their manuscript "Is there an etiological link of H. pylori infection to colorectal neoplasia? A review of current evidence." an interesting summary of the current literature about a potential link between H. pylori and the incidence of colorectal cancer / neoplasia. In general, the manuscript is nicely written, presented in a comprehensive manner, and well structured. Language needs only minor polishing, and apart from minor errors (eg. heading of table 2 is missing), structure and presentation of the manuscript is adequate. However, with regards to the content there are several aspects that have to be addressed in case on publication. 1) A description of the exact methods of the review process is missing. How did the authors search which databases, and which were inclusion or exclusion criteria for selection of references? 2) The authors use solely the Odds Ratio (OR) in order to describe correlations between H. pylori infection or gastritis and CRC. I doubt that all cited references indeed provided OR for their data. Did the authors calculate the OR, or did the authors only select references that provided OR? 3) The authors nicely discussed factors causing potential bias in the section "H. pylori infection status and colorectal neoplasia". However, a similar critical discussion of the other parts of the review (cross sectional

studies, meta analyses) is completely missing. And there are definitively aspects that should be addressed in order to allow proper interpretation of the data. For example, with regards to the presented meta analyses, the authors should provide information about: a. How many patients have been included in total in the different meta analyses to generate the respective data? b. How many original studies were used in more than just one of the meta analyses to generate data? How big is the overlap of underlying studies between the meta analyses? Are the meta analyses only showing similar results because the cited references are the same? c. What are the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the different meta analyses? Why do some meta analyses include only 9 studies, and others 28 studies? d. Information on quality and relevance of the different meta analyses are missing. For example, the second graphs states that some meta analyses contain “*only case-control studies”, and others “included only data based on East-Asian population”. This does not allow proper comparison of the respective results. Similarly, there are no details or critical discussion at all on the selected cross sectional studies provided. 4) The section “H. pylori-related chronic gastritis and colorectal neoplasia” contains only data from a single study. The results from this study are poorly presented (eg: “large national database of 156000 patients (mean age: 58.7 years, 41% males) who had undergone bidirectional endoscopy with biopsy results available from both procedures” => what nation? Why did the patients undergo bidirectional endoscopy? etc Furthermore, limitations of this study were only very briefly discussed. 5) From the data presented in the section “H. pylori-related gastric premalignant lesions and colorectal neoplasia” the authors conclude that “Progression to H. pylori-related gastric precancerous lesions, namely chronic atrophic gastritis and gastric intestinal metaplasia, appears to enhance by somewhat this risk”. This conclusion is in my opinion not supported by the presented data: 4 out of 6 studies show no correlation between atrophic gastritis and neoplasia, one study that shows a positive correlation includes only 99 patients, and the only larger study that supports this statement is the national study that was mentioned earlier, and information about the quality and relevance of this study is missing. 6) In my opinion, the manuscript would profit from a brief summary of the relevant findings at the end of each paragraph, as results are ofte

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18193

Title: Helicobacter pylori and colorectal neoplasia: Is there a causal link?

Reviewer's code: 00183453

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2015-04-11 12:53

Date reviewed: 2015-04-11 18:32

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 is quite well written It represents a comprehensive topic of the field It would be useful for the readers to include the discussion of PMID 23054412.