

## Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS

June 15, 2015

Dear Editor,



Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 17011-review.doc).

**Title:** UPDATE ON PATHOGENESIS AND PREDICTORS OF RESPONSE OF THERAPEUTIC STRATEGIES USED IN INFLAMMATORY BOWEL DISEASE

**Author:** Quetglas Emilio G, Mujagic Zlatan, Wigge Simone, Keszthelyi Daniel, Wachten Sebastian, Masclee Ad, Reinisch Walter

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 17011

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

- 1 Names have been fulfilled
- 2 Language certificate letter by professional English language Academic provided by one of the authors who has re-reviewed the manuscript for minor changes
- 3 Conflict of interest are now detailed
- 4 Abstract has been updated
- 5 Core tip now included
- 6 Audio core tip attached
- 7 PMID and DOI included in all references
- 8 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer

(1) However I feel that the authors attempted to convey too much information and in the process are not successful in achieving their aim. Text has been shortened by 2 pages and up to 20 references deleted

(2) The aim of the paper seems fairly broad and it is not clear from reading the abstract or the introduction that the main focus of the paper is on pathophysiology and pharmacodynamics. The conclusions drawn regarding genetic markers of disease as a potential clinical tool to predict response to therapy is less emphasized throughout the body of the paper despite the aim being largely focused on this. The abstract and the introduction have been modified to make focus clearer and how genetics and immunology can be used as predictors of the pharmacodynamics effect of drugs

(3) Even within the specific subsections of the paper the potential for specific genetic markers as clinical tools does not seem to be clearly focused on and seems to be lost among other markers...again, no specific problem with this, but the aim and introduction should be broadened to accommodate this if this is the focus of the paper. The aim and introduction have been broadened to bring clearer the role genetics and immunology can play as predictors of the effect of different compounds

(4) There is a tremendous amount of basic science summarized in this paper however it is my feeling that in a journal with a stronger clinical focus, this might be excessive, and would be better summarized and relayed to the reader in a more digested form. One of our aims while writing was trying to avoid basic science articles while including early human clinical trials because due to the novelty of this area those are just starting and there are very few who can be already translated into clinical use. Anyhow those less relevant have been deleted to make reading more digestive.

(5) The text should be closely reviewed by a native English speaker to address minor linguistic issues and improve the readability of the paper. A certified British Council translator has reviewed the article

and made some minor corrections

(6) The paper has a lot of merit and the topic is an important topic which should be addressed, however this paper would benefit from a more clear focus (consider even subdividing into 2 separate papers) and from a better digested body to more clearly relate this important data. With all modifications performed we think that now splitting the article into 2 would concrete in a loss of focus

Thank you again for evaluating to publish our manuscript in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Sincerely yours,

Emilio G. QUETGLAS, MD, PhD

Director of Medical Intelligence

Grünenthal GmbH

52078 Aachen

Germany

Tel.: +49 241 569-0, Fax: +49 241 569-1502

E-mail: [Emilio.quetglas@grunenthal.com](mailto:Emilio.quetglas@grunenthal.com)