



# Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8388

**Title:** Does the size of pouch formation as a gastric substitute after total gastrectomy influence the clinical outcome: a meta-analysis and systematic review

**Reviewer code:** 00227386

**Science editor:** Gou, Su-Xin

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-28 14:45

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-31 00:00

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 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)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments to authors This is an important paper but will need some revision before being considered for publication. The English is not idiomatic in many places and needs correction. In the 'Abstract Section' "RCT" where it is first mentioned needs to be given in full as "Randomised Control Trials", and under 'Results' in this section the "p" values are puzzling . A "p" value of p=0.792 is given as significant whereas usually only "p" values less than p=0.05 are thought to be significant. Likewise "p" values are not usually expressed as p=0 and reported as being not significant. The same problems arise again later in the Main text in the 'Results Section'. In the same 'Results Section' different pouches are described as RY, RY Pouch and JI Pouch. These pouches need to be described. Table 2 needs some clarification. The 'Eating Capacity per Meal' is expressed as a percentage, but what is this a percentage of? Likewise 'Body Weight' is expressed as a percentage, but once again this is a percentage of what? For a non-statistician Figures 1-5 are hard to understand, and as the findings are already given in the text I wonder if these Figures are really necessary.



# Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8388

**Title:** Does the size of pouch formation as a gastric substitute after total gastrectomy influence the clinical outcome: a meta-analysis and systematic review

**Reviewer code:** 02441402

**Science editor:** Gou, Su-Xin

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-28 14:45

**Date reviewed:** 2014-01-01 19:58

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 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)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

To the authors: With interest I have read the article entitled: "Does the size of pouch formation as a gastric substitute after total gastrectomy influence the clinical outcome: a meta-analysis and systematic review." By the authors Dong et al. In this paper literature is analysed regarding the question whether pouch size following total gastrectomy affects clinical outcome. The authors address an important question on which several studies have been performed. Several studies investigating the effects of small versus large pouch reconstruction are referred. However, the materials and methods section lacks a clear definition and description of what is regarded a large pouch or a small pouch. Therefore the heterogeneity between the included RCTs is unclear. In previous studies has been stated that long-term survivors (with a follow-up of up to 12 years) may benefit from a large pouch reconstruction. This aspect is not discussed appropriately. Finally, readability of the article can be strongly improved by reviewing the English grammar.



# Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8388

**Title:** Does the size of pouch formation as a gastric substitute after total gastrectomy influence the clinical outcome: a meta-analysis and systematic review

**Reviewer code:** 00160226

**Science editor:** Gou, Su-Xin

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-28 14:45

**Date reviewed:** 2014-01-04 00:27

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors performed a randomised study on the use of a new wireless oesophageal pH capsule that showed significant correlation to conventional catheter. However, I have a number of queries:

**Methods:**

- 1) It was not clear what are the groups of intervention that the authors were comparing with. What are the patients randomized to? Pls state in the methods section.
- 2) Pls add the difference between the new wireless probe and Bravo capsules to the methods section. Are there any copyright issues?
- 3) What was the primary outcome of the study? If you are trying to prove equivalence, shouldn't you perform a non-inferior study?
- 4) In the sample size calculation, it was mentioned a difference of 0.39 was estimated. What is this value?

**4) It was mentioned that correlation was determined by simple regression analysis. However, this should be better determined by Pearson's correlation coefficient.**

**Results:**

- 1) The use of supplementary information is confusing. Pls add to main text or delete excessive figures.
- 2) Can the authors explain why such a high percentage of patients (49.5%) experienced symptoms related to capsule attachment?

**Discussion:**

- 1) The use of unpublished data is discouraged and problematic if you are trying to quote in your discussion. Pls omit.
- 2) Also previous results in animal studies should have been published separately and not put in this paper.
- 3) What is the potential advantage of the new system over the Bravo system with longer battery life and higher sampling frequency?