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Reviewer’s report:

The aim of this study is very interesting, but there are some imprecisions and advices in order to accept it.

- An EGD was performed to 372 patients, but the text never explains the total number of patients with biopsies also. Particularly, the authors only specify the number of "IP" biopsies (46), the number of gastric biopsies (277). They also write the number of patients with normal finding of upper gastrointestinal tract (201). I suggest the authors to add this information (total number of patients biopsied) in order to more precise.

- I invite the authors to underline the discrepancy between endoscopic and histologic results.

The first sentence of "background" (line 69) gives the definition of IP, as a islands of gastric mucosa in the proximal esophagus. The gastric mucosa consists in a columnar epithelium, by definition. Consequently, a definition of endoscopic IP presents many limits.

In fact only 40 out the 46 cases biopsied presented gastric mucosa. This aspect underlines the difficulty to give a real endoscopic diagnosis of IP. I invite the authors to explain a little bit more this aspect, especially because they explain the difficulty to take biopsies from the proximal esophagus.

- In the "Discussion" the authors underline a prevalence of 14,5% of endoscopic IP. It could be interesting to add also the histologic prevalence of IP, in order to give another information and to underline the differences between these 2 data.


The gastric precancerous cascade. Correa P, Piazuelo MB.]
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
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