

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 55616

**Title:** Wareness and Attitude of Fecal Microbiota Transplantation through Transendoscopic Enteral Tubing among Inflammatory Bowel Disease Patients: A Multicenter Cross-Sectional Questionnaire-based Study

**Reviewer's code:** 03478404

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Romania

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-03-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ruo-Yu Ma (Quit in 2020)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-04-02 10:27

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-04-05 16:26

**Review time:** 3 Days and 5 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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>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 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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This research titled „Awareness and Attitude of Fecal Microbiota Transplantation through Transendoscopic Enteral Tubing among Inflammatory Bowel Disease Patients: A Multicenter Cross-Sectional Questionnaire-based Study” has the merit to represent the first large-scale study of its kind in patients with IBD, in an Asian country (China, including 3 centres). A big bonus is that the research was designed and performed by the members of the team who introduced the technique of Transendoscopic Enteral Tubing (TET) in 2016, as delivery method for FMT (Peng Z, Xiang J, He Z, Zhang T, Xu L, Cui B, Li P, Huang G, Ji G, Nie Y, Wu K, Fan D, Zhang F. Colonic transendoscopic enteral tubing: A novel way of transplanting fecal microbiota. *Endosc Int Open* 2016). And the long-standing goals of this team are to promote the development of FMT and FMT-related technologies, including TET. Since 2016, the members of this team published many papers regarding fecal microbial transplantation (FMT) and /or TET, mentioned in the References. Therefore, their experience led to this study, investigating attitude and awareness of patients with IBD towards FMT and TET, by questioning patients who already had it and patients without it. The general conclusion of the study was that patients require important education regarding FMT and TET. The manuscript is easily to be followed, contains accurate data, has a high scientific quality and represents an important tool for physicians and their patients. Comments: A. Title - well chosen. Abstract - well structured and contains main aspects of the study. Key words - properly chosen, and I appreciate that one of the key words is “Washed microbiota transplantation”(see reference from 2020 by Zhang Faming - inventor of the concept of TET) and also a recent study investigating its utility in Covid-19 pneumonia, by the same Zhang Faming

(<https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/results/NCT04251767?view=results>). Core Tip – very well synthesizing the main importance of the study. B. Introduction – the background is well presented (insisting on TET and its possibilities, describing the method and its advantages), as well as the importance/necessity of the study. Its length is appropriate. The aim is clearly emphasized. Small observation: line 98: reference nr. 10 is wrongly used there. It should be nr. 4 instead (He Z, Li P, Zhu J, Cui B, Xu L, Xiang J, Zhang T, Long C, Huang G, Ji G, Nie Y, Wu K, Fan D, Zhang F. Multiple fresh fecal microbiota transplants induces and maintains clinical remission in Crohn's disease complicated with inflammatory mass. Sci Rep 2017). Authors should insert correctly the reference nr. 10. C. MATERIALS AND METHODS: 1. Study design, setting, and participants – adequately written; the number of participants is large enough. 2. Questionnaire design – good idea to divide the participants in two groups. I would kindly ask the authors to provide the detailed questionnaire, especially regarding FMT and TET (even as Supplementary material). Statistical analysis – Please insert here that Multivariate analysis was also performed (since it was done, as we can see in the Results paragraph). D. Results are well presented, in the text and also in the Figures (1 to 4). Question about Table 1: Would the Authors agree to present those characteristics by detailing them in the 2 groups? Another question: 4.8% of the patients were under 18 years of age. Were they who answered the questions and/or the parents/legal guardians? Please specify. As regarding the results, it is interesting that almost half of the questioned patients not having had FMT were not aware of this possibility of therapy. Also, it is somehow surprising that mass media was a more common source of information than physician's recommendation. However, in "Discussion" the authors covered this explanation very well, sustained by existing literature. Another good finding is that, in the 2nd Group, patients with Crohn's disease were significantly more likely to choose mid-gut TET than patients in the 1st Group and also patients with



**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>

ulcerative colitis significantly preferred more colonic TET vs Group1. This aspect is well commented in "Discussion". Small observation: Line 187 – please add „s" to difference. E. "Discussion" is well approached, commenting their own results, giving plausible explanations and comparing them to the only few papers in the literature outside China and Taiwan. Authors mentioned that "perhaps the approach of physician's recommendation will be more effective in improving patient's cognition on FMT and TET than mass media in the future." Conclusion is clear and crispy. Small observations: Line 222 – please delete „which", as it is not appropriate in the sentence; Line 246: please replace „underwent" with „undergoing" and delete „comma and may", resulting in: Undergoing FMT through TET may improve the understanding of FMT and eliminate patients' concerns about the aesthetics of FMT. Line 250: please correct to „route, among"; Line 263: Please correct to: "the participants we surveyed were from Jiangsu and Yunnan province, which might not be representative of all population". F. Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form is not appropriate. G. I understand that there is no Non-Native Speakers of English Editing Certificate. However, it would be a good idea to get a professional correction (besides the modifications I suggested).

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 55616

**Title:** Wareness and Attitude of Fecal Microbiota Transplantation through Transendoscopic Enteral Tubing among Inflammatory Bowel Disease Patients: A Multicenter Cross-Sectional Questionnaire-based Study

**Reviewer's code:** 04913257

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Colombia

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-03-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-03-27 05:21

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-04-21 22:42

**Review time:** 25 Days and 17 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" 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>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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Your manuscript fully addresses an interesting and quite challenging topic. There is no strong evidence regarding the choice of the route to perform the transplant, however, the method proposed by you according to your results sounds as a favorable option and according to what patients have commented, widely tolerated. I am very pleased with the option and the results that you show. I am awaiting new publications for the application of this route in other countries.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 55616

**Title:** Wareness and Attitude of Fecal Microbiota Transplantation through Transendoscopic Enteral Tubing among Inflammatory Bowel Disease Patients: A Multicenter Cross-Sectional Questionnaire-based Study

**Reviewer's code:** 03478404

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Romania

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-03-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jie Wang (Quit in 2020)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-05-26 13:49

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-05-27 14:08

**Review time:** 1 Day

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" 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>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 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
<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



**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

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I am pleased with the corrections made by the authors and their new version, after the reviewers' and editor's suggestions. I ranked the quality of the manuscript as "very good" and it remains like that. However, there are still some minor comments/questions: 1. All required documents should be now titled as belonging to the World Journal of Clinical Cases, instead of the World Journal of Gastroenterology. 2. The page number in the STROBE Form is not inserted. 3. The title still contains more than 12 words. 4. "Audio core tip" does not have the proper format. It represents a pdf. file, with the biostatistics certificate. Please correct. 5. I asked the authors: "Question about Table 1: Would the Authors agree to present those characteristics by detailing them in the 2 groups?" "Response: Thank you for your kindly comment. The authors agreed to divide the patients into two groups for comparison." However, Table 1 does not provide two groups...or the file is missing. Please provide. 6. The "Non-Native Speakers of English Editing Certificate" is not provided.