

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The subject of the manuscript is very interesting and topical. It deals with the factors of IgA nephropathy and Crohn's disease and their relationship with both, IgA nephropathy and Crohn's disease. However, the manuscript is in the form of a draft paper and is not prepared for publication yet. In the manuscript, there is numerous information that is difficult to follow and understand. It seems that the factors and their link to both diseases are mostly listed and not properly explained or summarized. Therefore the manuscript is too concise and confusing. Since there is so much information it is very difficult to read and follow. I struggled to read it. It seems that also the author sometimes lost the red line. There is not much discussion about the mechanisms the author is talking about in the abstract. Molecular mechanisms of IgA nephropathy in general are very complex and are very difficult to follow particularly in the way they are written in the manuscript. The manuscript needs significant improvement regarding the introduction and aims so that it can be properly structured with sections and subsections and appropriate subtitles; all of which are currently lacking. There is no appropriate discussion and conclusion as well. Thus, I strongly suggest including more explanation of particular factors and also including the figure, where all these potential factors can be schematically presented to better understand the concept of the manuscript.

Response: We thank referees for careful reading our manuscript and for giving useful comments. It was fixed in accordance with you pointed out.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The entire review gives the impression of citing only clinical and laboratory data, which does not lead the reader to a clear understanding of the mechanisms of the disease pathogenesis. Therefore, I propose the complete readjustment of the text and its division into subsections, each of which will refer to a specific pathogenetic step, so that an acceptable conclusion can finally be reached. Moreover, The conclusion part needs to be completely reformed. It should briefly describe

the so far known pathogenetic steps, which should also be recorded schematically.

PCDAI is widely known. It should be removed.

In the introduction part and the second paragraph, the part from the words "...The etiology of... up to the words ...economic burden" should be deleted.

Response: We thank referees for careful reading our manuscript and for giving useful comments. It was fixed in accordance with you pointed out.