OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjm.98422
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Microbiology: 13(6); e98422

Peer Review Report for "Experimental Study of the Effect of *Helicobacter pylori* Infection on Barrett Esophagus and Its Correlation with Immune Function"

Author(s): Jing Zhang, Xiao-Ping Tan, Xin-Zhang Sun, Qing Zhang

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 21 Oct 2019
Revised Date: 7 Apr 2020
Accepted Date: 12 Apr 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 18 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1-The article must be edited completely (i.e pH instead of PH or SPSS version .. instead of SPSS and etc).
2- The article must be updated by using very new references 2019-2020 as well.
3- What is the article's message for the public in public health aspects.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 23 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
Abstract
- Background: add 2-3 sentences for this part.
- Use Helicobacter pylori instead of HP in through text.
Introduction

- Use Barrett's esophagus instead of BE in through text.
- Add objective of study at the end of the introduction.

Materials and methods

- Add sampling date, city, hospital, and country.
- General data: this part contains only data about methods. Some parts must be moved into the results section.
- Correlation: move into the statistical section.
- Add more microbiological details about the identification process of Helicobacter pylori.

Results

- Add results on Helicobacter pylori identification.
- The discussion is too long.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 23 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,

Thanks to the author for submitting the manuscript to JJM. I have completed the review of your manuscript and a summary is appended below (Pleases find attached files). The reviewers recommend the reconsideration of your paper following major revision. I invite you to resubmit your manuscript after addressing all reviewer comments. Please answer point by point to reviewer's comments on a separate sheet under WORD format and write your modifications in the revised version (WORD format) in colored or highlighted letters. Your answers to reviewers' queries are not only for the Editorial Board but for the readers and should be included, when appropriate, in the manuscript for improvement and a better understanding.

When the authors resubmitting the manuscript, please carefully consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments, outline every change made point by point, and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed. In addition, JJM INSTRUCTION attached to the mail, Pleases find it.

Note:

Please add ORCID number into you and your collages account, then automatically appear in your published papers in JJM both in HTML and pdf. Pleases follow the below link for the process. http://single.demo.pub/en/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#orcid.html

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 12 Mar 2020

Dear Author,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJM. I have completed the review of your manuscript and a summary is appended below (Pleases find attached files). The reviewers recommend the reconsideration of your paper following major revision. I invite you to resubmit your manuscript after addressing all reviewer comments. Please answer point by point to reviewers' comments on a separate sheet under WORD format and write your modifications in the revised version (WORD format) in colored or highlighted letters. Your answers to reviewers' queries are not only for the Editorial Board but for the readers and should be included, when appropriate, in the manuscript for improvement and a better understanding.

When resubmitting your manuscript, please carefully consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments, outline every change made a point by point, and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed. In addition, JJM INSTRUCTION attached to the mail, Pleases find it.

Note:

Please add ORCID number into you and your collages account, then automatically appear in your published papers in JJM both in HTML and pdf. Pleases follow the below link for the process. http://single.demo.pub/en/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#orcid.html

Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Reply to the reviewers' comments

Reviewer 1

Comments 1. Background: add 2-3 sentences for this part.

Use Helicobacter pylori instead of HP in through text.

Reply: We have added 2-3 sentences for this part and used Helicobacter pylori instead of HP in through text, such as "**Background:** Helicobacter pylori (HP) is an important pathogen in the upper digestive tract. It is of great significance to properly understand the risk factors for the transformation of BE into esophageal carcinoma. However, the relationship between HP and gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD) and BE remains controversial, the correlation with immune function has been rarely reported.".

Comments 2. Introduction

Use Barrett's esophagus instead of BE in through text.

Add objective of study at the end of the introduction.

Reply: We have used Barrett's esophagus instead of BE in through text and add objective of study at the end of the introduction, such as "This study aims to investigate the effect of Helicobacter pylori infection on Barrett's esophagus and its correlation with immune function. '.

Comments 3 Materials and methods

Add sampling date, city, hospital, and country.

General data: this part contains only data about methods. Some parts must be moved into the results section.

Correlation: move into the statistical section.

Add more microbiological details about the identification process of Helicobacter pylori.

Reply: We have added the relative information in the manuscript, such as “

2.3.1 Hp positive rate

In the Barrett's esophagus group, biopsy samples + two pieces of antral gastric mucosae were obtained from four quadrants of the esophageal lesion during the gastroscopy. In the GERD group and control group, biopsy samples + two pieces of antral gastric mucosae were obtained below the dentate line of the lower segment of the esophagus. These obtained samples were fixed in 10% neutral buffer formalin fixation solution. After paraffin embedding, the slices were prepared and stored. The sampling date was the first day when they were admitted in jingzhou city of China.

2.3.2 Rapid urease (RUT)

Fresh biopsy tissues from gastroscope were placed in the center of the yellow rapid urease detection paper (provided by zhuhai kaidi technology development co., LTD.), and then the adhesive was combined on the film to make the adhesive closely combined with the film, and the color change was observed within 1 ~ 3 minutes. The urease released by Hp can decompose the urease in the test paper into ammonia, which can make the phenol red indicator turn red, if there

is no Hp, the test paper will not change color. The tissue edge of the test paper changed from yellow to fuchsia within 1min is strongly positive, and that of fuchsia within 3min is weak positive, and that of non-discoloration is negative.

2.3.3 Warthin-starry silver dye method

The prepared paraffin sections were dewaxed with xylene. Then treated with 100%, 95%, 90%, 80% and 70% ethanol for 2min respectively, then washed with distilled water for 3min. Then the samples were dyed with 0.06mol/L silver nitrate solution for 60min under the condition of constant temperature and dark at 43℃. At 55℃, the samples were placed in developer solution for development. When the tissue was brown in 2~5min, the developer solution was immediately removed and washed with distilled water at 55℃. At last, the slices were dehydrated with ethanol and sealed with neutral resin. Under certain conditions, Hp adsorbs silver ions from the silver nitrate solution, and the adsorbed silver ions in Hp are reduced to black metal silver to develop color. Therefore, the background color of sections was mostly light yellow, and the stained Hp was brown and black, which was judged to be positive. Otherwise it is negative.”.

Besides, we have moved the “General data” into the results section, moved the “Correlation” into the statistical section.

Comments 4 Results

Add results on Helicobacter pylori identification.

Reply: We have added the relative information in the result section, such as “

3.2 Comparison of the positive rate of Helicobacter pylori among the three groups

There were 15 cases (37.5% (15/40) of Barrett's esophagus patients who were positive for Hp by rapid urease and Warthin-Starry argentation. The positive detection rate of GERD group was 42.5% (17/40). The positive detection rate of the normal control group was 57.5% (23/40). The difference in the positive rate of pH detected by the rapid urease test and Warthin-Starry argentation was not statistically significant (P>0.05) between the Barrett's esophagus group and GERD group. The positive rate of pH detected by the rapid urease test and Warthin-Starry argentation in both the Barrett's esophagus group and GERD group was lower than that in the control group (P<0.05, Table 1, figure 1). **”.**

Comments 5 The discussion is too long.

Reply: We have shorted the discussion section.

Reviewer 2

Comments 1 The article must be edited completely (i.e pH instead of PH or SPSS version .. instead of SPSS and etc).

Reply: We have corrected the ‘PH” to “pH” in the manuscript. shorted the discussion section and added the relative information, such as “We used the software program SPSS 20.0 (IBM, Chicago, USA) to conduct the statistical analysis. ’.

Comments 2 the article must be updated by using very new references 2019-2020 as well.

Reply: We have updated the references in the manuscript.

Comments 3 what is the article's message for the public in public health aspects.

Reply: The article's message for the public in public health aspects was that “Helicobacter pylori infection may protect against Barrett’s esophagus by reducing gastric acid secretion and increasing lower esophageal sphincter pressure, and has a certain correlation with immune function. Therefore, Helicobacter pylori may be beneficial for patients with Barrett’s esophagus.”.We have added this statement at the end of the discussion.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 12 Apr 2020

Dear Authors
According to the associated editor report, your manuscript is accepted for publishing in JJM and send to the publisher for the next process.
Note:
Please add ORCID number into you and your collages account, then automatically appear in your published papers in JJM both in HTML and pdf.
Thanks.