

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17096

Title: Effect of oral mesalamine on inflammatory response in acute uncomplicated diverticulitis.

Reviewer's code: 00028649

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-02-12 16:40

Date reviewed: 2015-02-13 16:42

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors described the first experience in using high doses of mesalamine in speeding resolution of acute uncomplicated diverticulitis on a retrospective analysis. Authors found that mesalamine supplementation, when compared to standard therapy alone, seemed to allow for a faster decrease of acute inflammatory parameters and for a faster recovery of the patients. These results are described for the first time and, despite the retrospective design of the study, are of some interest for clinical practice. However, the manuscript needs some improvements: Methods 1. Authors have to describe: a. how long was mesalamine treatment during the acute treatment; b. which antibiotic was administered in the two study groups: was it the same? By which route was administered (intravenously or by oral route?); c. whether and how acute diverticulitis resolution was assessed: by abdominal CT scan? On clinical assessment? 2. Have the authors assessed whether mesalamine influence the outcome of those patients? In other words, did the authors find a difference: a. in diverticulitis recurrence if treated with mesalamine supplementation or not? b. in controlling chronic abdominal symptoms if treated with mesalamine supplementation or not? Discussion 3. Authors



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

have to provide further explanation on the mesalamine failure in obtaining pain relief when compared to standard treatment. In particular, this point is quite differing when compared with patients suffering by symptomatic uncomplicated diverticular disease (SUDD), in whom mesalamine seems more effective than placebo in controlling abdominal pain (Kruis W et al, APT '13; Tursi A et al, APT '13). For example, could this behaviour be linked to the neuronal or motility alteration occurring in diverticulitis (see Simpson J, BJS '03)? 4. Author stated erroneously reference 9 as study assessing patients suffering from acute uncomplicated diverticulitis. That study doesn't assess acute diverticulitis but SUDD patients. Authors have to cite the study by Parente et al (Parente F. et al, IJCD, 2013) that supports their statement.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17096

Title: Effect of oral mesalamine on inflammatory response in acute uncomplicated diverticulitis.

Reviewer's code: 02945445

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-02-12 16:40

Date reviewed: 2015-02-22 11:23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors review their experience with use of mesalamine in the treatment of acute diverticulitis. I have several comments: 1) It should be mentioned whether IBD patients were excluded. 2) There are a number of points mentioned in the materials and methods that should be referenced (they are listed, but only later in the text). In particular: the authors mention evidence that relates to high-dose mesalamine administration and recent trials on the use of mesalamine in diverticular disease. 3) Primary endpoints should instead be successful non-operative treatment (e.g. need for surgery), time to resumption of oral food intake, and time to hospital discharge. This would make more sense based on the author's aims. 4) p values should be listed in the results section text. 5) There is a typo in the discussion. The sentence Two four arms open label trials should instead read "Two four-armed open label..." 6) There are additional limitations that should be included, such as the small number of patients and there may be significant selection bias as the study was not randomized.