

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 80330

Title: Secondary bile acids and the biliary epithelia: The good and the bad

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00069130

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: BM BCh, PhD

Professional title: Academic Fellow, Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-23

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-23 07:30

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-30 12:20

Review time: 7 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
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 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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1) Authors can include more figure and charts. For example, include a Pie chart showing the relative abundance of various bile acids in bile. This will help the readers to grasp the facts quickly. 2) I have found few spelling mistakes. I have highlighted some. Examples: In the abstract, last line (god instead of good). 3) Why secondary bile acids are more damaging? Direct toxicity due to its detergent/cell membrane destabilizing effect or other mechanisms? Mechanisms of transport of LCA. 4) Differences between small intestinal and colonic absorption of bile acids may be discussed. 5) Readers are from different backgrounds from clinicians to molecular biologists. Therefore, explain briefly the significance of mouse models, proteins etc. Examples: Mdr2-/- mice, SR gene 6) The anti-inflammatory and inflammatory role of bile acids deserves more explanation. 7) Figure-1: this figure can be improved. Example: Label type of cell shown.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 80330

Title: Secondary bile acids and the biliary epithelia: The good and the bad

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05689673

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-23

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-08 01:35

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-09 03:29

Review time: 1 Day and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<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
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 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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statementsConflicts-of-Interest: [☐] Yes [☒] No**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This review focused on the effects of secondary bile acids in the physiopathology of the biliary tree. I recommend revision of some aspects of the manuscript prior to publication: 1. A larger part of the abstract is rather general and descriptive. This part should be shortened. Instead, the authors should discuss in more detail their purpose, methods, the clinical and toxicological implications of their findings. 2. More secondary bile acids and the secondary bile acids in different species can be discussed and compared. Add more information on Table 2, e.g., effects on the inflammatory responses, potential targets, intervention strategy, etc. 3. The section of secondary bile acids can be divided with some subheadings, such as: therapeutic effect/toxic response of secondary bile acids, mechanism of effect/toxicity, involved signaling pathways, etc. 4. Several cited references need to be updated to the latest literatures. 5. There are some typos and grammar errors. I recommend proofreading by a native speaker.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 80330

Title: Secondary bile acids and the biliary epithelia: the good and the bad

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00069130

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: BM BCh, PhD

Professional title: Academic Fellow, Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-23

Reviewer chosen by: Han Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-18 06:14

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-20 10:18

Review time: 2 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <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>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have already given my comments in the first round of review, some of which are incorporated by the authors. The manuscript can be improved. There is still room for improvement. Example: Under 'UDCA beneficial effects on biliary epithelia (general)' The paragraph starts abruptly: "Further studies clarified the specific beneficial effects of this BA in diseases targeting biliary cells and causing an impaired biliary secretion (i.e. cholestasis) , such as PBC." Afterall, the authors need to do more justification to the title, which is very specific: Secondary bile acids and the biliary epithelia: the good and the bad. 'Secondary' bile acids specifically on 'epithelia' of bile ducts. Not quite insightful.