

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 17011

**Title:** MODE OF ACTION AND MONITORING OF RESPONSE OF THERAPIES USED IN INFLAMMATORY BOWEL DISEASE

**Reviewer's code:** 03261356

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-04-08 16:48

**Date reviewed:** 2015-04-13 21:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input 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 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Lian-Sheng Ma,

Thank you for asking me to review this manuscript.

I attempted to lodge my comments through the website but unfortunately received an error message.

My comments are below (not necessarily confidential to the authors – but preferably **anonymous**).

Kind regards,

Oren

This study is a tremendous work with an impressive review of the literature and grasp of several very complicated aspects of IBD

However I feel that the authors attempted to convey too much information and in the process are not successful in achieving their aim.

The aim of the paper seems fairly broad and it is not clear from reading the abstract or the introduction that the main focus of the paper is on pathophysiology and pharmacodynamics. The conclusions drawn regarding genetic markers of disease as a potential clinical tool to predict response to therapy is less emphasized throughout the body of the paper despite the aim being largely focused on this.

Even within the specific subsections of the paper the potential for specific genetic markers as clinical tools does not seem to be clearly focused on and seems to be lost among other markers...again, no specific problem with this, but the aim and introduction should be broadened to accommodate this if this is the focus of the paper.

There is a tremendous amount of basic science summarized in this paper however it is my feeling that in a journal with a stronger clinical focus, this might be excessive, and would be better summarized and relayed to the reader in a more digested form.

The text should be closely reviewed by a native English speaker to address minor linguistic issues and improve the readability of the paper.

The paper has a lot of merit and the topic is an important topic which should be addressed, however this paper would benefit from a more clear focus (consider even subdividing into 2 separate papers) and from a better digested body to more clearly relate this important data.