

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 73730

**Title:** Clinical challenge for gastroenterologists–Gastrointestinal manifestations of systemic mastocytosis: A comprehensive review

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05993507

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Spain

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-03

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-12-09 09:22

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-12-12 00:20

**Review time:** 2 Days and 14 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <b>Y</b> ] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [ <b>Y</b> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes 2  
Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript?  
Yes 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes 4  
Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status  
and significance of the study? Yes 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods  
(e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Not  
applicable 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in  
this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in  
this field? The authors present a concise mini-review analyzing an underrecognized  
issue, the gastrointestinal manifestations of systemic mastocytosis. 7 Discussion. Does  
the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key  
points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance  
to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and  
does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice  
sufficiently? The discussion is concise and accurate, reflecting clinical practice. 8  
Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and  
appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows,  
asterisks etc., better legends? Yes. The illustrations are well explained. 9 Biostatistics.  
Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Not applicable 10 Units.  
Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes 11 References. Does  
the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in  
the introduction and discussion sections? Yes. I recommend the authors to include a

reference about the prevalence of peptic ulcer in systemic mastocytosis. Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? They do not 12

Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes 13

Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes they did. 14

Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Yes they did. This mini-review summarize the main aspects of gastrointestinal involvement in systemic mastocytosis. The review is concise and pertinent as there are few works addressing this issue. The authors should pay attention to the approval status of TKI in mastocytosis. In the introduction (paragraph 9) they should update the approval status of midostaurin (FDA and EMA approved) and avapritinib (FDA approved). The authors should consider incorporating a reference supporting the sentence "The peptic ulcer due to the increase in histamine-related acid secretion is a condition not rarely observed in SM and it is largely underestimated: it is reported in up to 40% of patients with SM" (page 7, last paragraph). If the authors correct these minor findings, I consider that the quality of the manuscript is high and should be considered for publication.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 73730

**Title:** Clinical challenge for gastroenterologists–Gastrointestinal manifestations of systemic mastocytosis: A comprehensive review

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05910457

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MBBS, MS

**Professional title:** Chief Doctor, Doctor, Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** India

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-03

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-05-07 10:42

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-05-08 14:35

**Review time:** 1 Day and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

a meaningful study i accept your manuscript

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 73730

**Title:** A CLINICAL CHALLENGE FOR GASTROENTEROLOGISTS: GASTROINTESTINAL MANIFESTATIONS OF SYSTEMIC MASTOCYTOSIS, A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW.

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05842368

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-03

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-04-26 13:23

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-05-09 03:20

**Review time:** 12 Days and 13 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Generally the review is well written, but the structure could be improved. For example, I don't understand why '3.2 peptic ulcer disease' was specialized listed under 'pathophysiology'? Besides, it will be better if could talk more about differentiation with other gastrointestinal diseases.