

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 48969

**Title:** Ustekinumab: 'Real-world' outcomes and potential predictors of nonresponse in treatment-refractory Crohn's disease

**Reviewer's code:** 00503587

**Reviewer's country:** New Zealand

**Science editor:** Ruo-Yu Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-06-01 01:05

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-06-04 08:58

**Review time:** 3 Days and 7 Hours

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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This report comprises a retrospective assessment of outcomes of ustekinumab in adults with CD in one German centre

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS**

1. Instead of the term "CD patients" the preferred term would be "patients with CD" (multiple instances)
2. The last

sentence in para 1 of the INTRODUCTION requires revision to be more clear. 3. The INTRODUCTION is long and should be shortened and focused more 4. One assumes that the project was approved as a retrospective case review? and that direct patient consent was not obtained (other than for the NOD2 analyses)? 5. one further assumes that all the assays (calpro, MRE etc) were conducted on clinical grounds alone? 6. On page 13, it is stated that patients were enrolled. this implies an active recruitment process, but elsewhere it was made clear that this was just retrospective 7. There are some typographical errors (e.g. heterocytotous) that must be corrected 8. The median age (Table 2) is substantially lower than the age range given (61-68). are these numbers correct?? 9. Does the use of steroids at baseline reflect disease severity (if so is there not a more direct variable)? or is an direct effect of steroids upon the activity of the drug? 10. Some table titles/legends could be enhanced. 11. the spelling f tonsillitis should be corrected

## **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242

**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243

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

**<https://www.wjgnet.com>**