

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 79956

Title: Telenutrition for the management of inflammatory bowel disease: Benefits, limits, and future perspectives

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05452468

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-11 13:39

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-11 13:50

Review time: 1 Hour

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 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 Grade E: Do not publish |
| Judgment by peer reviewers | Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation? |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> [31] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [30] No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods? <input type="checkbox"/> [41] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? <input type="checkbox"/> [51] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? <input type="checkbox"/> [61] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [60] No |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review interestingly reviews to telemedicine applied to telenutrition. Some suggestions to implement the completeness of the work. Under 2. 2. Transition to Telemedicine and Telenutrition in Inflammatory Bowel Disease I would add some literature notes to better contextualize the impact of COVID-19 on IBD. Some work has highlighted how therapeutic adherence has been undermined and is an additional issue to examine in both the medical and nutritional settings. I would therefore recommend a closer look at some of the work in this regard (PMID: 35973931). In addition, I would add a mention to the fact that, in COVID-19, it was reported that even patients with controlled disease activity experienced psychological distress (PMID: 35346015) to stigmatize the need for remote telemedicine/telenutrition follow-up of patients with IBD. It could probably also be useful to recommend monitoring the, thus, psychological

dimension with various questionnaires already used in IBD (PMID: 2748771, 3204199), and it would also be useful to discuss the impact that psychology has on nutrition. Otherwise, the review is well written and thorough. I therefore recommend supplementing it with citations and discussion of them in the paper. Good work.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 79956

Title: Telenutrition for the management of inflammatory bowel disease: Benefits, limits, and future perspectives

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05409041

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Attending Doctor, Chief Physician, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-20

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-03 09:23

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-11 14:04

Review time: 8 Days and 4 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 |
| Judgment by peer reviewers | Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation? |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> [J31] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J30] No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods? <input type="checkbox"/> [J41] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? <input type="checkbox"/> [J51] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? <input type="checkbox"/> [J61] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J60] No |
| 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 statements | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? YES 2
Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript?
YES 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? YES 4
Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status
and significance of the study? YES 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods
(e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? YES
6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study?
What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field?
YES 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and
appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the
findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite



**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

manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? YES 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends?NO 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics?NA 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units?NA 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? YES 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate?NEEDS IMPROVEMENT 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting?NO 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics?NA