



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 50125

Title: Comparative Analysis of Fecal Short Chain Fatty Acids (SCFA) Profiles in gut diseases

Reviewer's code: 03536216

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-07-03 11:38

Reviewer performed review: 2019-07-05 03:03

Review time: 1 Day and 15 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript reported that evaluation of fecal SCFA profiles in gut diseases patients and to provide a non-invasive means of diagnosis to detect patients with CRC and AP. This paper has new information. However, there are some problems and flaws in



**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
https://www.wjgnet.com

presentation and discussion. I hope that my comments are very useful for the improvement of this research. Major comment (1) Differences in fecal SCFA could be influenced by differences in microbiota in intestine, but there is no discussion of this point. So, authors should discuss this point in discussion. (2) Didn't you find other SCFA such as caproic acid? I know this SCFA abundance is low, but if it has been detected, I would like it to be added to the discussion. Minor comment (3) Y axes title of Fig.1: Fatty acid composition -> Short-chain fatty acids composition (4) In Abstract Line 65: There is no need to explain the table in the abstract.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 50125

Title: Comparative Analysis of Fecal Short Chain Fatty Acids (SCFA) Profiles in gut diseases

Reviewer's code: 01404215

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-07-03 09:36

Reviewer performed review: 2019-07-05 11:19

Review time: 2 Days and 1 Hour

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input 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

The manuscript is interesting and the authors have performed a good work. Major Points 1: Patients with CEC are very old (mean value = 80 years old). Although the results are valid, for such cohort, another cohort of younger patients would probably



**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
https://www.wjgnet.com

result in different SCFA values. The study should take into consideration this limitation

2. The discussion should be edited once more, correcting the references mistaken: a) Anna Han study is not the one of the reference 47 (line 371, page 17) b) Previous findings of the authors do not fit well with reference 37 (authors are different) c) References (48, 49) (line 388, page 18) are not probably the ones of this paragraph. I think better (49, 50). d) I think the text should say in line 313 of page 18:compared to our CD group [51]. Authors should re-write the Discussion avoiding these mistakes

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No