

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

Manuscript NO: 39113

Title: Review of stem cells as promising therapy for perianal disease in inflammatory bowel disease

Reviewer's code: 01716595

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-03-29

Date reviewed: 2018-03-30

Review time: 1 Day

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well done. Would consider more appropriate for World Journal of Gastroenterology.

Would include more details on largest study and mention current phase 3 in US.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

Manuscript NO: 39113

Title: Review of stem cells as promising therapy for perianal disease in inflammatory bowel disease

Reviewer's code: 03538272

Reviewer's country: Australia

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-03-29

Date reviewed: 2018-04-02

Review time: 4 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 checked="" 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This mini-review on the use of stem cells for the treatment of perianal IBD/Crohn's disease describes the current literature on autologous and allogeneic adipose and bone marrow derived stem cells. This is an area of interest given the efficacy of published



**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

studies and the article is structured so that it is easy to follow. While the authors describe several relevant studies, my major concern is that the aim of the study and inclusion/exclusion of studies are not clearly listed. As a result, the article acts more as a brief description of some of the previous studies rather than something more substantial which would be of greater benefit to clinicians. There are substantial differences in the outcomes reported in the various studies and hence further details or descriptions of why this may be the case would help explain the apparent differences in results to readers across the trials and what the future direction of study would be (beyond stating that randomized study are necessary, more details on techniques of delivering stem cells the dose that is more efficacious and any preparation techniques that have been particularly promising). - Would you expect there to be a difference between the different types of stem cells and what would be the basis of this? Based on the available studies do you believe one type is superior or shows more promise compared to the others or are further studies required? - When did the search for articles for the review finish? For example, there is an article in Gastroenterology by Dietz et al. Autologous Mesenchymal Stem Cells, Applied in a Bioabsorbable Matrix, for Treatment of Perianal Fistulas in Patients With Crohn's Disease. This article was not included in your review, but it seems it should have been. Why? - More details are required in the table describing the differences in techniques used to administer the stem cells as this would allow readers to understand the differences in response rates – method of administration, number of treatments, amount of stem cells administered, concurrent therapies (e.g infliximab), inclusion criteria (such as disease severity, if stated), duration of study and definition of primary end point should all be included so readers will not have to revert to the text for these details. Minor comments: The last sentence in the first paragraph explains that the article reviews hematopoietic stem cells but it focuses on mesenchymal stem cells which as the authors say are non-hematopoietic. Please correct or clarify.



**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

Consider removing “promising” from the title. The use of frustrating in the first line of the conclusion is a bit emotive, consider changing it e.g. to problematic.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No