

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 31461

**Title:** Proposed criteria to differentiate heterogeneous eosinophilic gastrointestinal disorders of the esophagus, including eosinophilic esophageal myositis

**Reviewer's code:** 03009698

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-11-18 17:34

**Date reviewed:** 2017-01-06 13:55

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

Sato et al presented a study which determined the criteria to differentiate heterogeneous eosinophilic esophagus. The study reflected a different pathogenesis between EoE, sEoE, and EoEM. However there are several comments which need to be addressed: The number of patients with sEoE is only one. Could you increase the number of cases? Why do you choose patients with achalasia as the control group?

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 31461

**Title:** Proposed criteria to differentiate heterogeneous eosinophilic gastrointestinal disorders of the esophagus, including eosinophilic esophageal myositis

**Reviewer's code:** 03548292

**Reviewer's country:** Croatia

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-11-18 17:34

**Date reviewed:** 2017-01-30 11:19

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 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

Are you aware that out of 10 patients that were studied, 5 of them (50%) have the same disease (EoE) - the distribution far from ideal. Why was s-IgE so high in one patient with sEoE? Why is that relevant hence this patient cannot be differentiated from the patients with EoEM? The group with achalasia was used as the control group in this study - why? The sex ratio is not properly chosen (1F:9M). The incidence of disease is the highest before the fifth decade of life. Nevertheless, 5 cases refer to patients that were over 53 years of age at least. 50-80% of cases show coexisting atopy, while in this particular study, 3 out of 10 cases show allergies. Why wasn't the POEM/POEMb done on sEoE patient as well?

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 31461

**Title:** Proposed criteria to differentiate heterogeneous eosinophilic gastrointestinal disorders of the esophagus, including eosinophilic esophageal myositis

**Reviewer's code:** 02440886

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2017-01-03 15:22

**Date reviewed:** 2017-02-15 16:15

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 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

Dear Editors, Dear Authors,

Thank you for the invitation to review the Manuscript "Proposed criteria to differentiate heterogeneous eosinophilic gastrointestinal disorders of the esophagus, including eosinophilic esophageal myositis".

I found this paper of special interest, due to the extremely limited number of manuscripts present in the current literature about this topic.

The paper is clear and well written, even though some weak points can be addressed.

Firstly, the number of patients included is extremely low, therefore, it is difficult to obtain sufficient data to propose diagnostic criteria or guidelines applicable to a larger population. It could be of absolute interest to broaden the cohort of patients included, even in a multicenter study.

Secondly, it could be of interest to better specify the clinical context of the patients, including any clinical points apart from allergy, which could clarify if there are any possible condition influencing the infiltrate, for example any treatments.

Moreover, it could be clarified how the patients have been managed after diagnosis. Are the other



## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

eosinophilic esophagitis (subepithelial and myositis) managed with the same treatments of eosinophilic esophagitis? How are they followed up?

Regarding the subepithelial EoE and the EoM, what is the role of echoendoscopy? This exam could have an interest in measuring the depth of the wall and in evaluating the different layers, moreover it could be a valid option for a biopsy of the subepithelial layers.

Figures and tables are clear and exhaustive.

Overall, the paper could be implemented with a more numerous population before the publication, in order to reinforce the value of the obtained data.

No language polishing is necessary.

Major revision of the contents, especially regarding the number of patients, is suggested.