



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

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

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 34055

**Title:** \*Polymorphisms in oxidative pathway related genes and susceptibility to inflammatory bowel disease\*

**Reviewer's code:** 00225291

**Reviewer's country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-29

**Date reviewed:** 2017-04-11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is of interest. However, the results shown are somewhat weak. Only CCTTT 7 and 8 repeat show solid conclusions. Thus, a comment must be added commenting on the fact that, contrary to what was initially expected, no differences were found between patients and healthy subjects in the frequency of the polymorphisms analysed, and the implications this may have. This is not necessarily a caveat. Finding no differences may also yield a clue as to the underlying mechanisms in both diseases. And no comments are shown on the difference between CD and UC. Certainly, they are both IBD but they are different in their nature and pathophysiologic mechanisms and differences may then be expected. And if no differences are found in the pathways analysed it should be clearly stated in the manuscript. In addition, some minor corrections are required. 1. INTRODUCTION The sentence stating that "IBD was thought to be a Western disease..." might be changed "IBD was previously found mainly in Western countries...." In addition, when stating that its incidence has increased in



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

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

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

developing countries including Morocco, a reference specific for Morocco must be added, if available 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS/RESULTS There is a discrepancy in the number of healthy subjects analysed 311 in Materials and Methods and 308 in Results. Why? 3. RESULTS Readers are referred to a previous manuscript (35) when mentioning demographic and clinical data of patients. In addition to keeping the reference provided a brief picture of the population studied would help readers. Moreover, in this section, differences between both IBD, CD an UC, must be emphasized, if present. And if not, the absence commented. 4. MINOR GRAMMAR COMMENTS In the RESULTS section the sentence beginning with "Hundred ninety-nine patients..." should be changed to "One hundred ninety-nine patients..." In the DISCUSSION section, the paragraph (prior to the las one) beginning" In the other hand, the present study..." should be changed to "On the other hand, the present study..."



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

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

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 34055

**Title:** \*Polymorphisms in oxidative pathway related genes and susceptibility to inflammatory bowel disease\*

**Reviewer's code:** 02441062

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-29

**Date reviewed:** 2017-04-20

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting paper, concerning the role of genetic factors related to the oxidative pathway in the susceptibility of inflammatory bowel disease. There are some points that need to be addressed. 1. the number of healthy controls is 308 in the abstract, 311 in Materials and methods, and again 308 in results. This should be corrected. 2. the authors refer for demographic and clinical characteristics to a previous paper. In my opinion, a table with these data should be added. 3. in the discussion, when considering the paper by Oliver et al (23), demonstrating contrasting results with respect to the present paper, the different results should be commented and discussed.