

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics

ESPS manuscript NO: 26593

Title: The clinical significance of Barrett's esophagus with epithelial changes indefinite for dysplasia

Reviewer's code: 00068388

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2016-04-18 17:31

Date reviewed: 2016-05-02 19:47

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 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 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

There are a lot of paper about Barrett's esophagus. Maybe this paper needs some feature.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics

ESPS manuscript NO: 26593

Title: The clinical significance of Barrett's esophagus with epithelial changes indefinite for dysplasia

Reviewer's code: 03552525

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2016-04-18 17:31

Date reviewed: 2016-04-29 22:27

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 checked="" 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

Your review was interesting, but there are two Points to be improved. 1. There are "BE IND" and "BE-IND". You should use only one abbreviation. 2. Association of the length and progression is clinical problem which most of clinicians would like to know. So you should write about it in detail.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics

ESPS manuscript NO: 26593

Title: The clinical significance of Barrett's esophagus with epithelial changes indefinite for dysplasia

Reviewer's code: 00070191

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2016-04-18 17:31

Date reviewed: 2016-05-03 21:07

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

In this review the authors described the histological criteria for BE IND that is challenging with poor diagnostic reproducibility. Because it is difficult to predict the progression to malignancy in BE, the new clinicopathological parameters and biomarkers are also summarized. Basically this is a well-written review of an interesting topic. However some revisions are necessary 1. In a review about the histopathological criteria written by three pathologists it is surprising not to find any microscopic figure!. In the definition of BE IND section at least two figures should be included 2. Tables are too detailed and should be simpler and more precise . 3. English needs some brushing-up