



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 35260

Title: Fecal microbiota transplantation in patients with Clostridium difficile and significant co-morbidities and in patients with new indications: A case series

Reviewer's code: 03656594

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-07-31

Date reviewed: 2017-08-05

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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

The case description in the article is very detailed, the analysis is also very thorough. The article has a good clinical significance. Suggested publication.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 35260

Title: Fecal microbiota transplantation in patients with Clostridium difficile and significant co-morbidities and in patients with new indications: A case series

Reviewer's code: 00159305

Reviewer's country: Romania

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-07-31

Date reviewed: 2017-08-11

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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. In the group of 8 patients with conditions other than rCDI, FMT treatment was "experimental". Please, make it clear in Methods section that you had the approval for such therapy. For the reader is not clear if FIMEA approved FMT therapy in such patients. 2. Please, mention the strength and limitations of your study in the Discussion section. 3. In the Conclusion, indications for FMT in patients not having rCDI should be drawn more precisely, based on your study.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 35260

Title: Fecal microbiota transplantation in patients with Clostridium difficile and significant co-morbidities and in patients with new indications: A case series

Reviewer's code: 03317125

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-07-31

Date reviewed: 2017-08-13

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article gives a clear description of 21 cases and reasonable discussion, and I believe it can provide a good reference in the daily performance of FMT. But I still have some small advices: 1.The front part is about FMT treatments of patients with different co-morbidities, mainly focus on the immunocompromised patients, but there is no selection criteria or exclusion criteria mentioned, it's better to add. 2.Sufficient samples are crucial to drawing a statistically convincing conclusion. The sample with only 13 patients may be not enough to confirm the safety in FMT treatment for patients with significant co-morbidities. 3. There are some confusing and irrelevant statements in the article, such as the problem of "DIY FMT" doesn't seem to have much relation with the cases, it could be modified (or removed). 4. The language use of the article should be more careful, Page 18 Line 6 "effecs" should revise to "effects".