Baishideng Publishing Group

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 56364

Title: Gastrointestinal complications after kidney transplantation

Reviewer's code: 00009064
Position: Editorial Board
Academic degree: FRCP (Hon), MD, PhD
Professional title: Doctor, Professor
Reviewer's Country/Territory: India
Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2020-04-28
Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique
Reviewer accepted review: 2020-04-29 05:18
Reviewer performed review: 2020-05-03 17:26
Review time: 4 Days and 12 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

Baishideng Publishing Group

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

There is mismatch between the title and the material presented. A more appropriate title will be Diseases of the gut in post renal transplant patients or Gastrointestinal complications following renal transplantation. IBD refers to only UC and Crohn's disease. These are very few and hence only limited description of those in this review. On the other hand, a lot more space has been allocated to Graft vs host disease, MMF colitis , CMV colitis , none of which come within the ambit of IBD. Secondly, all these non IBD diseases have been well described elsewhere in the literature. Hence that is not needed in this review. Instead , in it the authors should limit their review of these conditions only in reference to post renal transplant patients rather than a general description of these conditions.

Baishideng Publishing Group

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 56364

Title: Gastrointestinal complications after kidney transplantation

Reviewer's code: 02440843

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: AGAF, FACG, MD

Professional title: Academic Research, Doctor, Full Professor, Lecturer, Research Scientist, Teacher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2020-04-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-04-29 16:44

Reviewer performed review: 2020-05-03 21:50

Review time: 4 Days and 5 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

Baishideng Publishing Group

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a highly comprehensive review that summarizes the data in the literature. Unfortunately, the authors have bypassed the steps required to develop a systematic review. Ideally, these steps are followed (and published on a website) prior to embarking on the review. This allows a clear picture of the actual objectives of performing the review and the methods used for selecting the articles that were reviewed, including methods to determine the level of bias in the articles. he review, on the other hand could be considered a "Critical Review of the Literature", which may or may not require a formal methodology to describe article selection. I suggest that the authors decide what type of review that they wish to publish prior to our complete evaluation of the manuscript. See this table and reference for further information Table 1. Checklist of items to include when reporting a systematic review (with or without meta-analysis). Section/Topic # Checklist Item Reported on Page # TITLE Title 1 Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both. ABSTRACT Structured summary 2 Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number. INTRODUCTION Rationale 3 Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Objectives 4 Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS). METHODS Protocol and registration 5 Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number. Eligibility criteria 6 Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years

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

considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale. Information sources 7 Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched. Search 8 Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated. Study selection 9 State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis). Data collection process 10 Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators. Data items 11 List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made. Risk of bias in individual 12 studies Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis. Summary measures 13 State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means). Synthesis of results 14 Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I 2) for each meta-analysis. Risk of bias across studies 15 Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies). Additional analyses 16 RESULTS Study selection 17 Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified. Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. Study characteristics 18 For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations. Risk of bias within studies 19 Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available,

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

any outcome-level assessment (see Item 12). Results of individual 20 studies For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group and (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot. Synthesis of results 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., health care providers, users, and policy makers). Risk of bias across studies 22 Additional analysis 23 DISCUSSION Summary of evidence 24 Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply Reference:The PRISMA Statement for Reporting Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses of Studies That Evaluate Health Care Interventions: Explanation and Elaboration