

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology*

**Manuscript NO:** 92085

**Title:** Sepsis during short bowel syndrome hospitalizations: Identifying trends, disparities, and clinical outcomes in the United States

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06454800

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2024-01-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2024-01-15 23:04

**Reviewer performed review:** 2024-01-15 23:57

**Review time:** 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<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
<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

(1) Is the manuscript important/innovative and why? In particular, does it contain new concepts, hypotheses, and/or mechanistic, diagnostic or therapeutic information, or does it represent a state-of-the-art review of the topic? YES (2) Is the manuscript well, concisely, and coherently organized and presented? Needs improvement. 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? NO 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? YES, but further details has to be provided, as noted below. 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? YES 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



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? YES 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams, and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative, with labeling of figures using arrows, asterisks, etc, and are the legends adequate and accurately reflective of the images/illustrations shown? YES 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? YES, but further details has to be provided, as noted below. 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? N/A 11 References. Does the manuscript appropriately cite 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? Please refer to comments 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? Good 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to BPG's standards for manuscript type and the appropriate topically-relevant category, 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. For (6) Letters to the Editor, the author(s) should have prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. Letters to the Editor will be critically evaluated and only letters with new important original or complementary information should be considered for publication. A Letter to the Editor that only recapitulates information published in the article(s) and states that more studies are needed is not acceptable? YES 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [office@baishideng.com](mailto:office@baishideng.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

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 I appreciate the opportunity to review this retrospective study, titled "Sepsis During Short Bowel Syndrome Hospitalizations: Identifying Trends, Disparities, and Clinical Outcomes in the United States." The study addresses an important topic in gastroenterology and demonstrates good methodological quality. Here are my specific comments: In the introduction, please elaborate further on the background of the topic and whether there are studies conducted outside of the US. Given the mention of a significant paucity of data on adult SBS hospitalizations complicated by sepsis in the United States, it would be beneficial to provide context on international studies or lack thereof. In the final paragraph of the introduction, explicitly articulate the primary and secondary objectives of the study, identify the target population under investigation, and delineate the key parameters being studied. This will provide readers with a clear roadmap for comprehending the study's purpose and focus, fostering a more precise understanding of the research scope and goals. In the statistical analysis, add details on how matching was done. Additionally, I recommend including a table that presents patients' demographics before and after matching. Add a reference after each sentence containing ideas taken from other studies. Consider adding an abbreviation section at the end of the manuscript for better clarity. In the discussion, enhance cohesion throughout, ensuring a smoother transition between ideas. I want to emphasize that these comments are intended to improve the paper's quality. Thank you for the opportunity, and I look forward to seeing an enhanced version of the manuscript. Sincerely,