



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78604

Title: A Concise Review on Short Bowel Syndrome

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 05710689

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Author’s Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-10 19:21

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-11 11:45

Review time: 16 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for an opportunity to review the manuscript titled: "A Concise Review on Short Bowel Syndrome". This paper provides an overview of the SBS, intestinal adaptation, management options and complications associated with SBS as well as its treatment. Some comments: - Section "Etiology And Pathophysiology" would benefit from including information about groups 1-3 of SBS. - Section "Intestinal adaptation" is a bit too brief – please expand. Moreover flow would be better if this section was moved after "Consequences Of SBS". - Table 2 seems out of synch with the text introducing it - I would recommend changing section header "Right Food Is The Medicine: Insight Into Nutritional Management" to just "Insight Into Nutritional Management" - The reported likelihood of PN weaning of 95% is misleadingly high, please see reference: Kopczynska et al. 2022 (DOI: 10.3390/nu14071449) - Regarding survival in SBS please see and add references: Pironi et al. 2012 (DOI: 10.1016/j.clnu.2012.05.004), Dibb et al. 2017 (DOI: 10.1016/j.clnu.2016.01.028), Amiot et al. 2013 (DOI: 10.1016/j.clnu.2012.08.007), Fuglsang et al. 2022 (DOI:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clnesp.2022.05.023) - "Intestinal Transplantation" section would benefit from quoting recent survival figures post transplant. - Conclusion: I would suggest using phrase nutrition instead of food. Also would suggest revising sentence "Intestinal transplantation is recommended for those in which conservative management fails" from "recommended" to "could be considered". Minor: - In introduction: most patients require parenteral nutrition (PN) but only rarely total PN (TPN), please revise - Aims: please change "food" to "nutrition". Moreover, remove exclamation point from the last sentence.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78604

Title: A Concise Review on Short Bowel Syndrome

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 02155135

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Italy

Author’s Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-07 13:12

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-16 20:10

Review time: 9 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The objective of the paper “A Concise Review on Short Bowel Syndrome”, by the authors Saraswathi Lakkasani, Deeksha Seth, Imran Khokhar, Masara Touza, Jeevan Reddy Pendli, Theodore Jr Dacosta is to : - make a short recap on etiology, physiopathology, consequences, and treatment options for Short Bowel Syndrome (SBS); - highlight the role of Nutrition in SBS treatment. The paper’s topic is very interesting, as SBS is a clinical condition that mostly verifies after surgical removal of the Small Bowel due to heterogeneous diseases such as, malignancy, radiation, Crohn’s disease and there are promising new drugs to help improve this disorder, but, in my opinion, there are several issues to be addressed. - The review is a narrative review, for a generic audience but, in its effort to be concise, the text lacks the kind of structure that makes it completely understandable also for someone who has never approached SBS before. This is partly due to the inherent complexity and rarity of the disease, which is not very well known on a large scale, but also due to the way the authors chose to treat the topic. For example, the first part of the article aims to summarize the physiopathology, consequences, and treatment options for Short Bowel Syndrome (SBS). In this first part, there is not an adequately clear explanation of the sequence of events that may cause the development of SBS, the mechanisms of intestinal adaptation, and nutrients' role in it, as it is central to the second part of the paper. Also, there is not an appropriate definition of intestinal failure and, furthermore, this first part lacks originality. - The second part of the article aims to briefly describe the treatments option for SBS and highlight the role of Nutrition in SBS. While I appreciated the authors' emphasis on the role of personalized treatment, I find the individualized approach should be described with more clarity. I found table 3 very useful in this



**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

regard but, to better emphasize nutrients' role in helping patients' weaning from Parenteral Nutrition, the individualized approach in every phase of SBS natural history should be described. - The role of intestinal transplantation in these patients is treated too superficially. A description of transplanted SBS rates or rates of post-transplantation survival in these patients should be added for accuracy and completeness. - Due to the narrative methodology of the review, I suggest adding it in the title and add immediately that it only refers to the adult population. - The use of the English language should be improved. Better use of the English language may be helpful to clarify some of the concepts expressed in the paper, that remain of uncertain meaning. Also, in some parts of the article, the English language is too colloquial and should be more suitable to the topic and the context.