

Rotterdam, March 21<sup>st</sup>

Dear Editors and Reviewers,

On behalf of all authors, we want to thank you for having considered our Manuscript as potentially interesting for WJG.

Please find our revised version of the Manuscript that we wish to be considered for publication on WJG. We appreciate both Editors' and Reviewers' efforts to improve the quality and clearness of the manuscript with important and constructive feedback.

We have carefully considered all comments and suggestions, and accordingly modified the manuscript. We hope that the Manuscript is now acceptable for publication on WJG.

A point by point reply to all raised issues by the Editors and Reviewers is attached.

We look forward to your response.

Yours sincerely,

**Annemarie de Vries, MD, PhD**, Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Erasmus University Medical Center, Doctor Molewaterplein 40, 3015 GD Rotterdam, The Netherlands. [a.c.devries@erasmusmc.nl](mailto:a.c.devries@erasmusmc.nl)

## **POINT-BY-POINT REPLY**

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade A (Priority publishing)

**Conclusion:** Minor revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** This manuscript presents a review of possibilities to improve surgical outcomes following intestinal resections in patients with Crohn's Disease already in the time prior to the surgical intervention. The focus is laid on nutrition, physical fitness, preoperative use of CD medication and guiding laboratory parameters. Title, abstract and key words are adequate. Background and Methods could possibly be improved by statements with respect to the literature search procedure (which libraries were searched, which key words used, which criteria were defined for inclusion or exclusion of papers retrieved) so the reader

learns about the completeness of used literature for pros and cons. Results may be clinically supportive for decision making, but do not come up with scientifically novel ideas or conclusions. The review shows a concise summary of current knowledge, enriched with strong personal opinions and points out areas for rewarding future clinical research. The 3 Tables are lengthy and in some way redundant to the body of the manuscript. Here is potential for shortening.

We want to thank the reviewer for the positive and constructive feedback. A method section, including a description of the literature search procedure, has been added to the Manuscript. In addition, we agree with the comments of reviewer on the included Tables. Therefore, we have excluded Tables 2 & 3 in the revised version of our Manuscript. We believe that Table 1 is a concise summary of the Manuscript and therefore helpful for the readers. As suggested to shorten the Tables, Table 1 is separated in two Tables (screening and intervention).

Reviewer #2:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** I congratulate the authors for carrying out this review. My only query is that this looks like a review , rather than an EXPERT VIEW. In EXPERT VIEW, I would expect a combination of literature review (referenced) as well as the authors views (also referenced). In my opinion, this manuscript looks more like a Review

We want to thank the reviewer for the positive and constructive feedback. With respect to Reviewer #2, we believe that the content of Manuscript suits more an Opinion Review than a Review. As commented by Reviewer #1, this Manuscript is enriched with personal opinions. These personal opinions are not all evidence based, but based on personal views or extrapolation from other areas of gastrointestinal surgery. Therefore, we would like to suggest to keep the category of our Manuscript is an Opinion Review.

## 6 EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

### *(1) Science editor:*

In this opinion review, the authors examined the current evidence on the impact of screening and management of modifiable risk factors on the postoperative course following an intestinal resection in CD patients. They also suggest prehabilitation strategies to optimize modifiable risk factors preoperatively, in order to improve the patients' outcome. The review shows a summary of the current literature. It could be useful for the readers to add the literature search strategy (key words, inclusion/exclusion criteria).

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

We want to thank the Science editor for the positive and constructive feedback. As suggested, a method section, including a description of the literature search procedure, has been added to the Manuscript.

### *(2) Company editor-in-chief:*

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Please authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content.

We want to thank the Company editor-in-chief for the positive feedback. We have revised our Tables and believe it meets the standard of WJG.