

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22265

**Title:** Four Cases of Acquired Double Pylorus: Clinical and Endoscopic Characteristics and Four Years Followed-up Observation

**Reviewer's code:** 01213276

**Reviewer's country:** Serbia

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2015-09-21 10:03

**Date reviewed:** 2015-09-26 16:42

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ Y ] Grade A: Excellent	[ Y ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ Y ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ Y ] No	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[ Y ] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this paper the authors describe a four cases of double pylorus. This is a rare condition and manuscript is well written. I kindly recommended it to be published.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22265

**Title:** Four Cases of Acquired Double Pylorus: Clinical and Endoscopic Characteristics and Four Years Followed-up Observation

**Reviewer's code:** 00227386

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2015-09-21 10:03

**Date reviewed:** 2015-09-30 17:27

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 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

This is an interesting report of four cases with the unusual finding of Acquired Double Pylorus and as such would be worth publishing as an addition to the present number of reported cases. Comments:- It appears that only two patients presenting with gastrointestinal bleeding were treated with pantoprazole and that the only active treatment otherwise was with antacids and the eradication of Helicobacter pylori infection and the omission of NSAID drugs. Is there any reason why all the patients were not given pantoprazole? This needs clarification. It is a pity that follow-up endoscopy was possible on only one patient, and that the follow-up had to be based on clinical symptoms. This has to be accepted. Before being considered as suitable for publication it does require several minor changes as listed below:- a) Page 3, "Core Tip". Line 4 . Should read: 0.001-0.4% " of upper gastrointestinal endoscopies" b) Page 4 top line reads better as two sentences. "penetrating ulcer. This condition is...." c) Page 5, "Endoscopic characteristics", The sentence "the observed channel contractions suggested....to the true pyloric rings" needs rewording as the meaning is not clear. d) Page 5-6. The overlapping sentence should read: "In two of the patients a

gastric ulcer was seen, in one case on the lesser curve of the antrum, and in the other case on the anterior wall adjacent to the accessory pylorus". e) Page 6. 4th line. should read: "duodenum", not "duodenums". f) Page 6. "intravenous pantoprazole (40-mg)" --- for how long? g) Page 8. Discussion. Line 5 "histologies" should read "histology", and Line 10. What is meant by a postpyloric ulcer? Shouldn't this be a duodenal ulcer? h) Page 10. 2nd para: "fistulous rings" has no meaning. Change to "fistulae". i) Page 11. 6 lines from the end: "resulted from nonadherence". What does nonadherence mean? Please clarify. Discussion The Discussion on pages 10 and 11 needs to be divided up into paragraphs with "First, Second, Third, Fourth" as separate headings to make easier reading. Then following these (on page 11) the sentence beginning "Among our four patients....." should begin as a new paragraph. Figures These are good but may be difficult to reproduce clearly when printed. Seven is a large number and the information is available in the text. I suggest selecting just the clearest (Fig 2) as showing a double pylorus and omitting the others.