



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19110

Title: Immunogenicity and mechanisms impairing the response to vaccines in patients with inflammatory bowel disease

Reviewer’s code: 00189171

Reviewer’s country: Hungary

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-05-12 14:12

Date reviewed: 2015-05-26 04:51

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Marin et al. reviewed the recent knowledge regarding the efficacy of vaccines and the possible mechanisms of impairing the response to vaccines in IBD patients. As more and more IBD patients need immunosuppression, which affect the efficacy of vaccination – the topic is very actual. This is a well written summary of the topic, however, I have some comments. In general: The parts of the manuscript which review the efficacy of the different vaccination is very useful. However, the parts which try to explain the possible mechanism of inefficacy of a given vaccination are confusing a bit for me. Proven mechanisms should be enhanced and support with references, while speculated mechanism should be just mention as a possibility. The number of the patients of studies reviewed in the hepatitis B section is very different. Data are presented in percentage and numerically also. In case of low number of patients, the numeric version is preferable in my opinion. (eg 3/6 instead of 50%). Uniform way of presentation of these data would allow the readers to weight the results properly. In the influenza section, I advise to review the paper of Balint et al. (Scand J Gastroenterol, 2015). Source of recommendation should be signed in the tables. Or it is an own



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>

recommendation? Formal: There are some misspellings and mistyping in the text (like: polymorphism, vaccines, etc.), these should be repaired. Minor language polishing is also recommended. Form of the references is correct? In summary: It is a carefully written review of the topic, which needs some formal and language polishing. Facts and presumptions should be detached regarding mechanisms of inefficacy of vaccines.