

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27944

Title: Clinical Features of Upper Gastrointestinal Serrated Lesions: an Endoscopy Database Analysis of 98,746 Patients

Reviewer's code: 00071356

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-06-24 10:37

Date reviewed: 2016-09-05 23:34

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 polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input 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 Authors present a study on serrated polyps of the upper digestive tract. To my knowledge is the largest study on this topic I ever read. They found on a very large sample study of 98,746 patients who underwent EGDS study only 21 (0,02%) patients with serrated polyps of UPGI demonstrating "per se" the rarity of these lesions. Moreover the Authors try to find an association between the serrated polyps of the UPGI and colorectal adenoma. Major comment I have some concerns about the statistics of thi study. It is not clear the random selection of the so called "control group". How was this group selected? I think that for the purpose of this study the Authors should perform a propensity score matching method. Alternatively they should compare the rate of adenoma detection to the cumulative incidence of colorectal adenoma in the whole sample study or they should refer to the literature data. Moreover as suggested by the wide 95% CI of the OR of adenoma and advanced adenoma detection rate, the interpretation of these findings could result in a type II error because of a small sample size.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27944

Title: Clinical Features of Upper Gastrointestinal Serrated Lesions: an Endoscopy Database Analysis of 98,746 Patients

Reviewer's code: 03643842

Reviewer's country: Czech Republic

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-06-24 10:37

Date reviewed: 2016-09-05 16:12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input 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 manuscript called "Clinical Features of Upper Gastrointestinal Serrated Lesions: an Endoscopy Database Analysis of 98,746 Patients" is a descriptive study focused on the evaluation of upper gastrointestinal serrated lesions as a negative prognostic marker of colorectal cancer. Although the prevalence of serrated lesions in UPGI was very low, the authors analyzed an exceptionally large cohort of patients who underwent esophagogastroduodenoscopy and precisely described the target group of patients. Minor comment: Cox proportional hazard model would enhance the validity of the presence of UPGI serrated lesions as an independent negative prognostic marker for CRC.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27944

Title: Clinical Features of Upper Gastrointestinal Serrated Lesions: an Endoscopy Database Analysis of 98,746 Patients

Reviewer's code: 02922607

Reviewer's country: Pakistan

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-06-24 10:37

Date reviewed: 2016-09-09 21:22

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 polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input checked="" 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 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

Important concept. However, needs to be extensively re-written preferably by an expert in English.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27944

Title: Clinical Features of Upper Gastrointestinal Serrated Lesions: an Endoscopy Database Analysis of 98,746 Patients

Reviewer's code: 02526196

Reviewer's country: Denmark

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-06-24 10:37

Date reviewed: 2016-09-13 15:49

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

Peer review for World Journal of Gastroenterology Ms:

ESPS Manuscript NO: 27944

Authors: Hailong Cao, Wenxiao Dong, Mengque Xu, Yujie Zhang, Sinan Wang, Meiyu Piao, Xiaocang Cao, and Bangmao Wang Title:

Clinical Features of Upper Gastrointestinal Serrated Lesions: an Endoscopy Database Analysis of 98,746 Patients

GENERAL COMMENTS: In this study, authors select the upper gastrointestinal (UPGI) serrated lesions as study topic. Through retrospective study, authors analyzed the clinical and pathological features of serrated lesions in UPGI and also evaluated the colonoscopy findings at same time. Although the serrated lesions in UPGI are rare in the population, it is very important to understand its clinical and pathological features as such lesions maybe related to invasive carcinoma in UPGI exhibited. Furthermore, authors found in this study that the serrated lesions in UPGI are associated with higher colorectal adenoma detection rate. Therefore, the manuscript is good for the readership of WJG. The format of manuscript including the cited literatures should be modified according to the request of the Journal. **SPECIFIC COMMENTS:** Title: The title accurately reflects the major topic and contents of

the study. Abstract: The description of aim, material and methods, result and conclusion sections is Ok. Introduction: It is well written. Material and methods: 1, Section of Design and patients is ok. 2, In section of Endoscopic procedure, only procedure of colonoscopy is mentioned, however the procedure of EGD is not mentioned. In fact, this study focus on UPGI serrated lesions, therefore the procedure of EGD is very important. 3, Section of Pathological evaluation. Is the biopsy or the resected lesions taken by EGD? If yes, the procedure should be mentioned. 4, Section of Statistical analysis is ok. 5, In relation to the groups of the study, author should unify the name of groups throughout the manuscript, such as control group or average group. Results: This section clearly described the results obtained from the study. Discussion: The discussion is well written. References: The references are appropriate, relevant, and updated. Tables and figures: Figure and tables are appropriately presented. Minor comments 1, Page 2, line 10 "...these patients which underwent colonoscopy simultaneously or within six months..." should read as "...these patients who underwent colonoscopy simultaneously or within six months...". 2, Page 2, line 21 "...in the duodenum intramucosal carcinoma." should read as "in the intramucosal carcinoma of duodenum.". 3, Page 3, line 9 "...and sessile serrated adenoma/polyp are divided," should read as "and sessile serrated adenoma/polyp have been divided,". 4, Page 3, line 12 "UPGI nonconventional adenomatous and nonadenomatous type of dysplasia, " should read as "UPGI nonconventional adenomatous and nonadenomatous types of dysplasia". 5, Page 8, last line of table 2: About >10 mm, please indicate what lesion is over 10 mm. CLASSIFICATION OF THE MANUSCRIPT Grade B. LANGUAGE EVALUATION Grade B