

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 36020

Title: Psychiatric Morbidity after Surgery for Inflammatory Bowel Disease: A Systematic Review

Reviewer's code: 03476292

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-08-30

Date reviewed: 2017-08-31

Review time: 1 Day

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very well written study on a subject that few physicians take note of. The burden that IBD has on patients is well known for whoever treats these patients on a regular basis. Adding the stress of the surgical procedure to the already complex mental status of these patients can have a significant impact on patients lives. I commend the authors for a job well done !

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 36020

Title: Psychiatric Morbidity after Surgery for Inflammatory Bowel Disease: A Systematic Review

Reviewer's code: 02941507

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-08-30

Date reviewed: 2017-09-03

Review time: 4 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 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

Please comment (discussion section) on the necessity to examine in future studies the psychiatric status of the same group of patients with IBD before and after the surgical intervention, in order the results to be more representative.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 36020

Title: Psychiatric Morbidity after Surgery for Inflammatory Bowel Disease: A Systematic Review

Reviewer's code: 00159305

Reviewer's country: Romania

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-08-30

Date reviewed: 2017-09-08

Review time: 9 Days

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

To the authors, General comments 1. I am afraid you have not read the instruction for the author! Please, make corrections at the References. 2. There are too many grammar/spelling errors throughout the text. Please, make corrections. Major concerns. 1. Absrtract. It is confusing and should be rewritten. If the aim of your review was " to examine if patients with IBD have higher risk of psychiatric comorbidities after surgery compared with no IBD patients you should mention in the results how many of patients with diverticulitis, inghinal hernia or cancer were included in no IBD group. Conclusion should be drawn more precisely, and refer to the aim of the review. Pay attention to t Crohn's disease!! 2. Core-tip is lacking. 3. Key words is lacking. 4. Introduction. Page 3, 3rd paragraph should be rewritten Last paragraph is rather confusing: "the objective of this review was to examine..." ... "this review assessed the



**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

following study questions.."! 5. Methods, Page 4: Inclusion criteria, last line "studies in all languages" (impossible!) Page 5,6: Please, give some details regarding study qualities assessment and publication bias (Egger's test, funnel plot?) Important: statistical analysis is lacking; please, write it. 6. Results: First paragraph:"risk of bias was assessed using NOS" (!) (NOS is for quality assessment!) Outcomes (!) regarding depression/anxiety are confusing, difficult to be followed by the readers of the journal. Crohn's disease. Please take attention how to write Crohn's disease!!! 7.Discussion. Page 10: rewrite first sentence , second paragraph "looking at patients...we only found results looking..."!! Page 11, the last three lines ("chicken or egg dilemma") should be deleted. 8.Conclusion. Page 12. I agree with the first sentence . Key points: Charlson 's comorbidity instead of Carlson. I regret I cannot recommend your manuscript to be published until a major revision dealing with the above mentioned comments is made.