



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, United States

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 Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8221

**Title:** Dairy products consumption and gastric cancer risk: a meta-analysis

**Reviewer code:** 00053727

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-23 11:00

**Date reviewed:** 2014-02-24 14:45

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors analyzed the association of Dairy products in gastric cancer and found that there is no significant increase of gastric cancer .The result are compiled from the available literature.The meta analyzes may be of interest to the readers of gastroenterology however the manuscript has to be thoroughly reviewed by a statistician .



**ESPS Peer-review Report**

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8221

**Title:** Dairy products consumption and gastric cancer risk: a meta-analysis

**Reviewer code:** 02454124

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-23 11:00

**Date reviewed:** 2014-02-25 23:25

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The paper is potentially interesting since it deals with a very interesting issue in gastroenterology, as well as in public health medicine. However, some major amendements are required, before submitting again the manuscript in a revised version for publication on the Journal. 1) The authors used only one serch engine (PubMed), while the PRISMA guideline (see for details <http://ijphjournal.it/article/view/5768> ) states a systematic review and a meta-analysis require at least two databases. 2)I suggest to use the PRISMA statement as a guideline in performing again the study. As an example, a Flow-chart of the search is missing, in which the authors specified the steps of the literature search, explaining graphically all the process they used for the retrieving of the 39 studies. In the first boxes the results for each literature database needs to be specified, giving details also for the use of the terms used in the bibliographic search 3) A quality assessment is missing. The authors can easily use the Newcastle-Ottawa scale in order to evaluate the methodological quality of the observational studies included in this meta-analysis. Moreover, this quality assessment must be used for a sensitivity analysis, dividing the meta-analysis for good and low quality studies. 4) The use of mixing results coming from case-control and cohort studies is questionable, and in this case is competely to be avoided. I suggest to remove from the text those parts in which this mixture was done



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, United States

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 Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8221

**Title:** Dairy products consumption and gastric cancer risk: a meta-analysis

**Reviewer code:** 01550345

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-23 11:00

**Date reviewed:** 2014-02-26 19:36

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The issue is important and the work is well conducted. Some minor points : - I suspect that you underestimate some POSITIVE findings, as the Yogurth issue, which implies the Microbiome ! - the average RR for dairy was 1.11 (0,94-1,31), but for Yogurth was 0,66 which is not identical to 1, although the smallness of the single study may not overcome type II error. The term 'nonsignificant' in the discussion, does not reflect exactly the data. An RR of 0,77 (0,58-1,03) does not accept plainly the null hypothesis (1,03 very different from 0,99 ??). I do suggest a softer discussion, highlighting the data, non only the 'p' !



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, United States

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 Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8221

**Title:** Dairy products consumption and gastric cancer risk: a meta-analysis

**Reviewer code:** 00224495

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-23 11:00

**Date reviewed:** 2014-02-28 10:53

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a meta-analysis article that investigated the relationship between dairy products consumption and gastric cancer risk. This is a well written article in spite of heterogeneity of the data of relevant articles. I believe this article has sufficiently achieved the standards required in order for publication, once minor revision has been done. In subgroup analysis by geographic region, the authors subgrouped them by Asia, America, and Europe. However, countries with a high prevalence of stomach cancer include Japan, Korea, Eastern Europe, Central America, and Iceland. So it would be more meaningful to have subgroup analysis based on countries with high and low prevalence rates, instead of geographic region. I would like to suggest an alternative title being "consumption of dairy products and gastric cancer risk" or "dairy produce consumption and gastric cancer risk", not "dairy products consumption and gastric cancer risk". If the authors could revert to the BPG's writing requirements of review articles; 5-10 key words that reflect the content of the study must be included, more than 100 references must be cited, etc.