

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 63546

Title: The role of mesenteric component in Crohn's disease: a friend or foe?

Reviewer's code: 05039386

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: DVM, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-19 12:41

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-24 13:52

Review time: 5 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgooffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Please, see specific comments below: 1. Title is quite generic, could be more specific. 2. Abstract is informative and reflect the work. 3. The keywords could be improved because repeat words from title. 4. Background: is adequate and reflect the manuscript content. 5. Methods: does not apply because is a review paper. 6. Results: does not apply because is a review paper. 7. Conclusions: does not apply because is a review paper. 8. Illustration is in high quality and adequate. 9. References are coherently organized and necessary.