

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology*

Manuscript NO: 73129

Title: Gut microbiome: linking together obesity, bariatric surgery and associated clinical outcomes under a single focus

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05225141

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DVM, PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-10 14:08

Reviewer performed review: 2021-11-15 01:54

Review time: 4 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Baishideng **Publishing**

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

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review summarizes the underlying mechanism of bariatric surgery on obesity treatment, focusing on gut microbiota. However, the novelty of the manuscript is low and the reference over past five year is less than 50%. In addition, some definition is misleading. The last but not the least, some of the context has been published, without any change in this manuscript. Gut microbiome is not an alternative name of gut microbiota. The armamentarium of metabolic surgery procedures includes laparoscopic adjustable gastric band (LAGB), vertical sleeve gastrectomy (VSG), Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (RYGB), biliopancreatic diversion (BPD), and BPD with duodenal switch (BPD/DS)[37][38]. In a recent systematic review, Davies et al. summarized 14 clinical studies, with a total of 222 subjects (RYGB = 146, VSG = 25, biliointestinal bypass = 30, vertical banded gastroplasty = 7, and adjustable gastric band = 14). The exact contributing mechanisms which induce the GM alterations after bariatric surgery are not clear as different factors have been suggested namely diet, weight loss, or surgery itself. Moreover, no differences regarding GM modulation were observed among the two most currently performed weight loss surgery techniques, i.e., RYGB and VSG. (Gut Microbiome-Related Diseases and Therapies, edited by one of the authors). A calibrated transgastric window is created using a circular stapler creating a 20 mL gastric pouch volume. The sentence is from reference [36], but authors reference between [41] and [42,43]. In the same study, the lowest calcium concentrations were observed after 1200 days in the RYGB group, and after 239 days in the VSG group, respectively. (doi: 10.3390/nu12010235) Grammar errors: the GM affect obesity > the GM affects obesity; to the narcotic bowel syndrome > the narcotic bowel syndrome; the growth of facultative



aerobic microorganisms (such as Proteobacteria) and inhibition of anaerobic microbes is > are; more than one gut hormones > hormone; Carefully check across the manuscript.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology*

Manuscript NO: 73129

Title: Gut microbiome: linking together obesity, bariatric surgery and associated clinical

outcomes under a single focus

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05937294

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-19 11:08

Reviewer performed review: 2021-11-19 11:23

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority)[] Accept (General priority)[Y] Minor revision[] Major revision[] Major revision[] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reported an interesting minireview linking together obesity, bariatric surgery, and associated clinical outcomes under a single focus. There are a few issues that should be addressed by the authors before consideration for publication: ------ 1. The authors should explain how their findings make a difference for the readers of the Journal of World Journal of Gastroenterology? 2. Improvements to the English language within your manuscript are requested.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology*

Manuscript NO: 73129

Title: Gut microbiome: linking together obesity, bariatric surgery and associated clinical outcomes under a single focus

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05342613

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACS

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-19 09:10

Reviewer performed review: 2021-11-29 08:12

Review time: 9 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] 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? IT IS ADEQUATE. 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? EXCEPTIONAL, WELL DESIGNED 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? WELL REVIEWED AND DOCUMENTED 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? EXCELLENT 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? TABLES ARE OK I HAVE A SUGGESTION; I BELIEVE IT WOULD BE BETTER IF SIMPLE PICTURES OF THE SURGICAL TECHNIQUES WERE PLACED AND THE READER BRIEFLY IMAGINED THE PROCEDURE. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? - 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? NO 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and



discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? GOOD 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? VERY GOOD 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? WELL DOCUMENTED, I HAVE NO SUGGESTION 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? NO



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology Manuscript NO: 73129 Title: Gut microbiome: linking together obesity, bariatric surgery and associated clinical outcomes under a single focus Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; externally peer reviewed Peer-review model: Single blind Reviewer's code: 05225141 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: DVM, PhD Professional title: Doctor Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States Author's Country/Territory: Greece Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-10 Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Hong Liu Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-12 16:22

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-12 21:38

Review time: 5 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous





statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The revised manuscript does not include appropriate Tables data. A new upload is needed. No additional question.