

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7031

Title: Association of P268S, JW1, and N852S polymorphisms of the NOD2/CARD15 gene in Zhuang patients with Crohn's disease in Guangxi, China

Reviewer code: 00503112

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-11-02 21:05

Date reviewed: 2013-11-06 01:59

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This brief paper demonstrates the relationship of the P268S polymorphism in NOD2/CARD15 to Crohn's disease susceptibility in an ethnic Zhuang population. While the scientific findings in this paper are limited, documentation of genetic variation in CD susceptibility among various ethnic and regional groups is useful.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7031

Title: Association of P268S, JW1, and N852S polymorphisms of the NOD2/CARD15 gene in Zhuang patients with Crohn's disease in Guangxi, China

Reviewer code: 02446061

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-11-02 21:05

Date reviewed: 2013-11-07 12:40

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors: Your manuscript is interesting regarding the aim. However some points should be improved before to consider the manuscript for publishing in WJG of other Scientific journal. a) As you mentioned, the relative small sample size limits the inference power of this study. Then, the impact of this work should be clearly supported for a deeper analysis in comparison to previous works. b) Several references should be added to introduction section in order to enriching the understanding of current scope about IBD physiopathology and genetics relationship (V. Gr. Khor B, Gardet A, Xavier RJ. Genetics and pathogenesis of inflammatory bowel disease. Nature. 2011 Jun 15;474(7351):307-17). c) Some grammar errors are present through the manuscript, please check it. d) The sentence 'All of the patients had a well-established diagnosis of UC or CD, according to standard clinical criteria based on endoscopic and histopathological examinations' Needs a Reference; "standard" clinical criteria can be variable!. e) The sentence in material and methods section: 'There were no significant differences in age or sex between the study group and the control group'...Is about data in Table 5?. Consider move it to a posterior section. f) Results are poorly described. Moreover, links with tables or figures with results are lacking. g) Discussion can be enriched if specific data on the cited articles or additional ones are included. The comparison with previous data and validity of the presented data are poorly supported. For all above mentioned, I suggest a deep revision previous to consider publishing in WJG. With best regards, Reviewer