

**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 32847

**Title:** Genetic polymorphisms of MAFK, encoding a small maf protein, are associated with the susceptibility to ulcerative colitis in Japan

**Reviewer's code:** 03669101

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2017-02-01

**Date reviewed:** 2017-02-15

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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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**

This case control study study investigated the association between genetic polymorphisms of MafK and ulcerative colitis (UC) susceptibility. The authors found that rs4268033 AA and rs3735656 CC genotypes were significantly associated with the susceptibility to UC. Major points 1. As the authors said that the mean age of controls was relatively high. The association of age and genotypes need to be clarified. 2. The control people are also patients suffering from other diseases. Community people will be better choice. 3. The diagnostic criteria of UC should be mentioned. 4. Are there differences in genotypes between male and female?



# 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

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 32847

**Title:** Genetic polymorphisms of MAFK, encoding a small maf protein, are associated with the susceptibility to ulcerative colitis in Japan

**Reviewer's code:** 02445708

**Reviewer's country:** Poland

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2017-02-14

**Date reviewed:** 2017-02-17

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] 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"/> [ Y] 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"/> [ Y] No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript reports an interesting and original data. The claims are convincing and fully supported by the experimental data. The experimental procedures appear to be well done. The authors provided sufficient methodological detail that the experiments could be reproduced. Statistical analysis is well done. The claims are appropriately discussed. Overall, the paper is well written.