

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Stem Cells*

**Manuscript NO:** 88842

**Title:** Role of anti-tumor necrotic factor therapy in Crohn's perianal fistula closure rate after stem cell transplantation

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 07025170

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** N/A

**Professional title:** N/A

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-10-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yu-Lu Chen

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-11-29 09:50

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-12-09 05:15

**Review time:** 9 Days and 19 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear editor, this is an research article about the application of stem cell transplantation. I think this submission and its results is reasonable and valuable. However, I do not think the current version can meet the high standard of this journal. Some comments are shown below: 1. Introduction: "Stem cell transplantation is a promising therapeutic option..." You should provide a clear statement on how your study's approach or findings differ from or build upon existing research, as currently, your introduction lacks specific differentiation from previous studies. 2. Efficacy of Combined Treatment: "Furthermore, the combination of medication and surgery was more effective than either alone, with 52% and 43% complete healing rates, respectively[15]." To clarify the efficacy rates of combined treatments compared to individual treatments, please reference specific studies. 3. Patients and Clinical Variables: There is no concurrent control group for patients undergoing surgery. In your "Methods" section, discuss and acknowledge potential biases in methodology or data analysis, and explain how these biases were mitigated. 4. Single Stem Cell Transplantation: "All patients included in this study received only one stem cell transplantation." This statement seems to contradict the

abstract, which states, "A total of 65 procedures of 64 patients were included." Please verify and correct this to resolve any contradictions. 5. Management of Anti-TNF Therapy: "Anti-TNF agents: Infliximab was administered two and six weeks after the first dose, and eight weeks after the third dose. Adalimumab was administered every two weeks after the first dose." You should clarify the administration protocol for anti-TNF agents, including specific situations for medication, dosage, and any adjustments based on patient response. 6. Method of Autologous ASC Preparation: I recommend swapping the order of autologous ASC preparation with surgical procedures, anti-TNF agents, and postoperative management in the "Methods" section. Also, add detailed steps of ASC preparation, such as cell culture conditions, culture duration, cell counting, and quality control. 7. Result Statement on Fistula Closure Rate: "All patients who received anti-TNF treatment experienced fistula closure within two years. The 1- and 2-year closure rate for anti-TNF-treated patients was 63.0%, and 66.7%, respectively." Reconfirm and rephrase these results to avoid confusion due to the apparent contradiction between sentences. 8. Follow-up Period in Recurrence Rate: "During the follow-up period of approximately 5 years, 14.0% of patients with fistula closure experienced recurrence." Since Figure 2 only shows up to 3 years, and the result is around 14%, clarify the exact follow-up duration. 9. Discussion - Future Research: "However, few studies have focused on the long-term outcomes..." Your discussion lacks direction for future research. Suggest areas for future investigation, particularly regarding long-term outcomes. 10. Conclusion - Summarizing Key Findings: "Anti-TNF therapy did not increase CPF closure rates..." The conclusion is brief and lacks a summary of the study's implications. Provide a concise summary of the main findings and their significance in the field. 11. Overall Structure - Emphasizing Novelty: The entire manuscript. The novel aspect of your study is not prominently highlighted. Throughout the manuscript, regularly emphasize the unique aspects or contributions of

your study. 12. General - Addressing Biases: The entire manuscript. The manuscript does not address potential biases in study design or data interpretation. Discuss and acknowledge any potential biases in the methodology or data analysis, and how they were mitigated.