

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 26481

Title: IBS-C Management with Quebracho, Conker Tree and M. balsamea Willd Extracts

Reviewer's code: 03252939

Reviewer's country: Portugal

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2016-02-23 17:53

Date reviewed: 2016-03-14 16:36

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | BPG Search: | <input checked="" 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

Overall: This study tests an alternative hypothesis to treat patients with IBS, which is a prevalent disease, with impairment of quality of life, and frequently, the available treatments are not enough. Testing new approaches is of major importance. However, this study included 24 patients from a single centre and a retrospective analysis, where patients were selected according to adherence to medical recommendations was performed. Statistics: paired t-tests. Means and standard deviations are used. Was normality checked? A group of 24 is likely non-normally distributed. Conclusions: The conclusion is too adamant for a retrospective study with 24 patients. To address these issues I suggest to consider this study as a pilot study or preliminary results, and highlight limitations of small retrospective studies where patients are selected in accordance to therapeutic adherence: namely bias and confounders.