



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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 23125

Title: Determination of the cut-off score of an endoscopic scoring method to predict whether elderly patients with dysphagia can eat pureed diets

Reviewer's code: 00058573

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-10-27 20:22

Date reviewed: 2015-10-31 01:34

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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

Nice study. Well conceived and written. The only drawback is that it is a retrospective study. Such a study needs to be prospective. It addresses an issue of great practical value. The authors mention in the "limitations" that "Finally, all subjects were older than 65 years. It is unknown whether the prediction based on the Hyodo?Komagane endoscopic score are applicable to those less than 65 years old. ". Whereas in inclusion criteria, they included patients >65 years. Since its a retrospective study, why the authors didn't include younger patients as well. Kindly answer this.