



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology*

Manuscript NO: 107273

Title: Barrett's Esophagus: A Review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06534794

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree and professional title: Associate Chief Physician, MD, PhD

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2025-03-19

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Lin Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2025-03-31 02:00

Reviewer performed review: 2025-03-31 14:23

Review time: 12 Hours

Content to be reviewed	Does the manuscript's content fall within the scope of the journal? Yes Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? Yes Do authors' affiliations correspond to the content of the manuscript? Yes Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? Yes Are the Key Words complete? Yes Is the content of the Introduction adequate? Yes
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete?

Not Applicable

Is the description of the experiments clear and complete? **Not Applicable**

Are the experimental data presented in the manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? **Not Applicable**

Are the experimental data of the Results true and reliable? **Not Applicable**

Are the quality and resolution of the images up to standard? **Yes**

Do the selection and design of the figures and tables follow the principles of necessity and clarity? **Yes**

Is there any duplication between various parts of the manuscript and between the main text and the content presented in the figures and tables? **No**

Are the figures and tables numbered consecutively in the order in which they appear in the manuscript? **Yes**

Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? **Yes**

Is the Conclusion reasonable? **Yes**

Are all references necessary and reasonable? **Yes**

Do authors omit important references? **Yes**

Are all references related to the topic of the manuscript? **Yes**

Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? **No**

Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? **Yes**

Will the manuscript's content be of interest to readers? **Yes**

Are additional experiments needed for the study? **No**

Does the research scope comply with ethics? **Not**



	Applicable
Scientific quality	Grade B (Very good)
Novelty of this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Language quality	Grade B (Very good)
Does this manuscript describe a study of the existing knowledge system?	Yes
Does this manuscript report a revolutionary innovation?	No
Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?	No
Conclusion	Minor revision
Re-review	Yes
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for this comprehensive review of Barrett's esophagus covering epidemiology, pathogenesis, clinical features, diagnosis, and management, which is well-illustrated and thoroughly detailed. The following suggestions are provided for consideration: 1. While the manuscript demonstrates a comprehensive organizational framework encompassing Introduction, Definition, Epidemiology, Pathogenesis and Risk Factors, Progression to Esophageal Adenocarcinoma, Preventive Strategies, Clinical Features, Diagnosis, Surveillance, Treatment, and Conclusion, notably absent are several critical components



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

mandated by the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology's review article specifications, which should include (1) a structured abstract, (2) 5-7 keywords optimized for database indexing, and (3) an author-generated core tip section highlighting innovations. 2. As the diagnosis section cites the 2022 ACG Guideline for endoscopic screening recommendations, please consider supplementing comparisons of endoscopic surveillance recommendations between Asian and Western consensus statements if applicable. 3. While referencing PPI therapy ("Once daily PPI therapy is advised in patients that do not have contraindications to their use to prevent ongoing acid-mediated damage to the esophageal mucosa"), it would be valuable to briefly mention potential long-term complications of daily PPI use. 4. Recommend revising "low-grade dysplasia" and "high-grade dysplasia" to "low-grade intraepithelial neoplasia" and "high-grade intraepithelial neoplasia" to align with internationally recommended terminology. 5. Including histopathological images alongside endoscopic figures (Figure 4) could enhance readers' understanding of diagnostic criteria. 6. As a comprehensive review, the current manuscript demonstrates limitations in its reference scope, with only 6 out of 46 citations (13%) originating from the past three years. Certain sections exhibit over-reliance on a limited number of references (e.g., Reference 4 being cited too many times in this review). To enhance scholarly rigor and reflect contemporary advancements, we strongly recommend expanding the reference list to incorporate recent high-impact studies on Barrett's esophagus, particularly those presenting conflicting or debated findings regarding pathogenesis, risk factors, surveillance strategies, and therapeutic outcomes. During the reference supplementation, authors may consider employing Reference Citation Analysis (RCA), an artificial intelligence-powered open-access multidisciplinary citation analysis database (available at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>), to facilitate systematic literature evaluation.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology*

Manuscript NO: 107273

Title: Barrett’s Esophagus: A Review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 07921103

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree and professional title: Chief Physician, MD

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Author’s Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2025-03-19

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Lin Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2025-04-01 16:06

Reviewer performed review: 2025-04-01 16:37

Review time: 1 Hour

Content to be reviewed	<p>Does the manuscript’s content fall within the scope of the journal? Yes</p> <p>Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? No</p> <p>Do authors’ affiliations correspond to the content of the manuscript? Yes</p> <p>Is the content of the Introduction adequate? Yes</p> <p>Are the Key Words complete? No</p> <p>Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? No</p>
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete?

Not Applicable

Is the description of the experiments clear and complete? **Not Applicable**

Are the experimental data presented in the manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? **Not Applicable**

Are the experimental data of the Results true and reliable? **Not Applicable**

Are the quality and resolution of the images up to standard? **Yes**

Do the selection and design of the figures and tables follow the principles of necessity and clarity? **Yes**

Is there any duplication between various parts of the manuscript and between the main text and the content presented in the figures and tables? **Yes**

Are the figures and tables numbered consecutively in the order in which they appear in the manuscript? **Yes**

Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? **Yes**

Is the Conclusion reasonable? **Yes**

Are all references necessary and reasonable? **Yes**

Do authors omit important references? **No**

Are all references related to the topic of the manuscript? **Yes**

Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? **No**

Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? **Yes**

Will the manuscript's content be of interest to readers? **Yes**

Are additional experiments needed for the study? **No**

Does the research scope comply with ethics? **Yes**



Scientific quality	Grade A (Excellent)
Novelty of this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	Grade A (Excellent)
Language quality	Grade A (Excellent)
Does this manuscript describe a study of the existing knowledge system?	Yes
Does this manuscript report a revolutionary innovation?	No
Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?	No
Conclusion	Minor revision
Re-review	Yes
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, Thank you for submitting your manuscript entitled “Barrett’s Esophagus: A Review”. I was pleased to receive it as a reviewer. This is a well-researched and comprehensive review on Barrett’s esophagus that synthesizes current knowledge on the epidemiology, pathogenesis, clinical presentation, diagnosis, and management. The inclusion of established and emerging diagnostic modalities, as well as insights from major clinical trials, adds value for clinicians. However, I have a few comments and suggestions for your consideration: 1. There are instances where similar content is repeated across sections, especially in the discussions on the inflammatory milieu in



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

GERD, smoking, and obesity. Would you consider revising these overlapping pathophysiological discussions? 2. The summary of the ASPECT trial is appreciated; however, the limitations and implications could be connected to current clinical practice more clearly. Could you briefly comment on how these findings have influenced (or failed to influence) guidelines and clinical decision-making? 3. You note the higher prevalence of Barrett's esophagus among males and Caucasians but stop short of discussing potential biological or socioeconomic contributors. Consider adding a few sentences exploring possible underlying mechanisms. 4. The brief mention of AI-assisted detection near the end of the diagnostic section is interesting. Could you discuss specific tools or research efforts currently in development? Even a short paragraph would be helpful. 5. Terms such as "intestinal metaplasia," "specialized intestinal metaplasia," and "SIM-EGJ" are used throughout. To avoid confusion, would it be possible to unify or more clearly differentiate these terms when first introduced? 6. There are a few typographical and grammatical issues (e.g., "connecation" instead of "connection," "od the esophagus" instead of "of the esophagus") that could be resolved with another careful pass through the manuscript. Overall, this is a well-constructed and informative review that is of clinical relevance. I appreciate your contribution and hope these suggestions assist in revising an already strong manuscript. With kind regards,



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology*

Manuscript NO: 107273

Title: Barrett’s Esophagus: A Review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 06783427

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree and professional title: Assistant Professor, PhD, Postdoctoral Fellow

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author’s Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2025-03-19

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Lin Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2025-03-31 02:42

Reviewer performed review: 2025-04-02 07:31

Review time: 2 Days and 4 Hours

Content to be reviewed	<p>Does the manuscript’s content fall within the scope of the journal? Yes</p> <p>Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? No</p> <p>Do authors’ affiliations correspond to the content of the manuscript? Yes</p> <p>Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? Yes</p> <p>Are the Key Words complete? Yes</p> <p>Is the content of the Introduction adequate? No</p>
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



	<p>Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete? No</p> <p>Is the description of the experiments clear and complete? No</p> <p>Are the experimental data presented in the manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? Not Applicable</p> <p>Are the experimental data of the Results true and reliable? Not Applicable</p> <p>Are the quality and resolution of the images up to standard? Yes</p> <p>Do the selection and design of the figures and tables follow the principles of necessity and clarity? Not Applicable</p> <p>Is there any duplication between various parts of the manuscript and between the main text and the content presented in the figures and tables? No</p> <p>Are the figures and tables numbered consecutively in the order in which they appear in the manuscript? Yes</p> <p>Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? Yes</p> <p>Is the Conclusion reasonable? Yes</p> <p>Are all references necessary and reasonable? Yes</p> <p>Do authors omit important references? Yes</p> <p>Are all references related to the topic of the manuscript? Yes</p> <p>Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? No</p> <p>Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? Yes</p>
Scientific quality	Grade B (Very good)
Novelty of this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)



Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Language quality	Grade B (Very good)
Does this manuscript describe a study of the existing knowledge system?	Yes
Does this manuscript report a revolutionary innovation?	No
Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?	No
Conclusion	Major revision
Re-review	Yes
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This seems to be a narrative review. Are there systematic methodologies employed for literature selection or quality evaluation of the included studies? Failure to do so restricts the robustness of the results derived. The clinical characteristics, diagnosis, and treatment are extensively examined. Can the authors discuss any regional variances in practices or outcomes? Does the review encompass recent advancements, such the significance of artificial intelligence in the endoscopic diagnosis of Barrett's esophagus, or novel biomarkers? The article fails to indicate whether the review addresses various stages of dysplasia or risk assessment methodologies for progression to esophageal cancer. These factors are essential for clinical management.