



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 11269

Title: Performance of the ASGE guidelines for Dyspepsia in a Saudi Population: A Prospective Observational Study

Reviewer code: 00183658

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-05-13 15:56

Date reviewed: 2014-05-21 10:16

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article from Saudi Arabia is aim to evaluate the adherence of primary care physicians to dyspepsia guidelines, to describe the common endoscopic findings, to evaluate the importance of “red flag” symptoms and to estimate the prevalence of H. pylori in dyspeptic patients. The title is “Performance of the ASGE guidelines for Dyspepsia in a Saudi Population: A Prospective Observational Study”. There have some questions and uncleared issues. The authors should to be clarified and be added the following issues in the text.

1. This study is a prospective observational study. Some limitations might be occurred.
2. Several factors influence the performance of the ASGE guidelines. Please clarify and add these issues in the text.
3. The variety of primary care physicians.
4. Please also add the difference of the performance of the ASGE guidelines between the eastern and western countries including between the developed and the developing countries in the text.
5. The clinical application of the study is very important. The authors should to be recommended the readers to apply this knowledge into routine clinical practice.
6. Please revise the manuscript into the WJG style.

Thank you so much



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 11269

Title: Performance of the ASGE guidelines for Dyspepsia in a Saudi Population: A Prospective Observational Study

Reviewer code: 00504544

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-05-13 15:56

Date reviewed: 2014-05-27 23:13

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Author, I have carefully reviewed the abovementioned paper, with the following conclusions: Major issues: 1. The sample size is too small for such a dyspepsia study. Conclusions about such a prevalent condition need to be based in a sufficient sample size. However, there no previous sample size calculation in the methods section, that should always be present in this type of study. 2. Some issues about patient’s selection are concerning, as mean age, of 40.3 years, young for endoscopy in a dyspeptic population, a high proportion of patients with a prior endoscopy, even with more than one endoscopy, which could bias the results. 3. Abnormalities should be defined and listed in a table. It is surprising to find GERD as an endoscopic finding in 17% of patients, even more when GERD (which is a syndrome, but not an endoscopic finding) was an exclusion criterion. 4. It is surprising to find a previous endoscopy as an independent risk factor to have endoscopic findings. Previous findings should be listed and I think patients with abnormalities in a previous endoscopy should be excluded from the analysis. 5. The sample size and the number of patients with relevant findings do not allow the author to make statements about the validity of alarm symptoms. Of note, multivariate analysis was irrelevant, maybe due to the short sample size. 6. The final part of the discussion is reiterative. 7. English is very good except some isolated spelling mistakes (“duodunitis”).



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 11269

Title: Performance of the ASGE guidelines for Dyspepsia in a Saudi Population: A Prospective Observational Study

Reviewer code: 00048752

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-05-13 15:56

Date reviewed: 2014-06-05 16:24

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study, the authors have tried to demonstrate factors related to the positive endoscopic findings based on the ASGE guideline/ Study design is nice and analysis is clear. Their results should be useful for the general readers