



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 91855

**Title:** Washed microbiota transplantation for Crohn's disease: A metagenomic, metatranscriptomic, and metabolomic-based study

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05462152

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MPhil

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2024-01-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2024-01-29 00:30

**Reviewer performed review:** 2024-01-29 01:20

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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. Well done. This study addresses a subject which is greatly needed for not only better understanding mechanisms of the gut microbiome but providing foundational evidence that can be used for future research. While the study is small, this information is helpful to know. 2. I am not an expert in Crohn's disease. Could the authors please either explain the CD Activity Index (CAI), Harvey-Bradshaw Index (HBI), and Simple Endoscopy Score (SES) more (such as what cut-off values are meaningful and what they mean) or add references for articles that explain these? 3. Similar to Comment #2, could the authors please define in the methods what the Montreal classification is in Table 1? 4. At the beginning of the AE portion of the Results section, could the authors please explain what the number 22 is in reference to? In the methods, it was noted that there were 22 stool samples. However, it appears there were only 11 participants who received the treatment and would be expected to potentially experience an adverse event. The Results subsection on AEs also does not seem to add up overall. Perhaps I am misunderstanding the numbers but it looks like this section indicates there were two individuals who experienced AEs in the first sentence and yet the rest of the description makes it sound



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** office@baishideng.com  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](https://www.wjgnet.com)

like there were four individuals. 5. Supplementary Figures 4, 5, and 6 appear to only be mentioned in the Discussion section. It appears there is quite of bit of text in the Discussion that describes results and should be moved up to the Results section. I do see that references to other studies are intertwined with this text though. I will leave the decision on the location of this text as a judgement call for the editors, but I think this seems like it should be included in the Results.