

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 45119

Title: Gluten immunogenic peptide excretion detects dietary transgressions in treated celiac disease patients

Reviewer's code: 00039368

Reviewer's country: Estonia

Science editor: Ruo-Yu Ma

Date sent for review: 2018-12-14

Date reviewed: 2018-12-20

Review time: 5 Hours, 6 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an elegant, well designed, performed and written observational, prospective, cross-sectional study for the evaluation of efficiency of ELISA and point-of-care (PoCT) for detection of gluten immunogenic peptides (GIP) excretion in stool and urine in celiac

disease (CeD) patients on gluten-free diet (GFD). The authors aim also to explore the association of dietary transgressions with symptoms in CeD patients on long-term GFD. The authors investigated altogether a remarkable amount of patients, e.g. 44 of 62 screened CeD adults presenting detailed description of inclusion and exclusion criteria applied to select enrolled patients and samples received and analyzed. The authors give a sufficiently clear overview about the study background and raised clearly the aim of the study, which is fulfilled. The statistical analysis was specified sufficiently well. The Tables and Figures are correct and give a good overview about the results. The material studied is large enough and allows to draw the conclusions. The Results are presented clearly and have been discussed well. The authors found that the detection of GIP in stool and urine can catch dietary transgressions in celiac disease patients on long-term GFD who are unaware of gluten consumption. The results have also practical application because simple home-based methods may aid in self-assessment of dietary indiscretions in CeD patients on a long-term GFD. Important finding of this study was that using ELISA and PoCT for detection of gluten immunogenic peptides is possible to detect gluten contaminations that do not cause symptoms. I found one misprint in the line 158: it should be added "in stool", I suppose: PoCT in stool and urine samples...

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<https://www.wjgnet.com>

[] The same title

[] Duplicate publication

[] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 45119

Title: Gluten immunogenic peptide excretion detects dietary transgressions in treated celiac disease patients

Reviewer's code: 00188995

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Ruo-Yu Ma

Date sent for review: 2018-12-14

Date reviewed: 2018-12-21

Review time: 3 Hours, 7 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have studied excretion of gluten immunogenic peptide. 1. The results of the study do not support the conclusion. However, the results do not support their conclusion. The kappa value in this study is 0.317 (value less than 0.4 is not considered

good agreement). Also, positive GIP excretion was noted in 17.9% subjects with dietary transgressions (line 239-241) – this suggest that the remaining 82.1% patients who had dietary transgression were not picked up by the test. Hence this questions the performance of GIP excretion tests. 2. The number of symptomatic patients is high considering that they were on GFD for at least 2 years. Was there a selection bias for recruiting the patients? What was the sampling strategy and how was the sample size calculated? 3. Why did the three GIP excretion test perform differently? As there was no gold standard for comparison, it is difficult to interpret whether the positive tests were true positive or false positive and same holds true for negative tests. 4. Table 3 and 4 should be simplified. The language of paper in the results section needs to be more simple and clear. For example, the meaning from sentence 243 is not clear. 5. As significant number of patients had symptoms but were on strict GFD, what was the cause of symptoms in them?

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 45119

Title: Gluten immunogenic peptide excretion detects dietary transgressions in treated celiac disease patients

Reviewer's code: 01555264

Reviewer's country: Iran

Science editor: Ruo-Yu Ma

Date sent for review: 2018-12-14

Date reviewed: 2018-12-23

Review time: 4 Hours, 9 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study, the authors assessed dietary compliance in celiac disease patients treated for more than two years with the gluten-free diet, using a combination of conventional and newly available tools, during the real-life conditions. The assessment included the



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

quantitative determination of excretion of gliadin immunogenic peptides (GIP) in stool which was determined by ELISA and the newly developed point-of-care (PoCT) tests for real-time detection in stool and urine. their study has the novelty of comparing these PoCT tests for use at home or office, with the more conventional dietary assessment and laboratory-based tools. Another point of novelty includes the comparison of performance of these tests in celiac patients presenting with or without symptoms. their results demonstrate these new tools, which can be performed by the patient or by the health care provider, detect dietary indiscretions independently of symptoms.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No