



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology  
**Manuscript NO:** 36037  
**Title:** Abundance of Enterobacteriaceae in the colon mucosa in diverticular disease  
**Reviewer’s code:** 00181101  
**Reviewer’s country:** Italy  
**Science editor:** Yuan Qi  
**Date sent for review:** 2017-09-26  
**Date reviewed:** 2017-10-06  
**Review time:** 10 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input 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 checked="" 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**

This is an interesting and well-written research on possible colonic microbiota differences between healthy subjects and patients with diverticulosis/SUDD. Follow some major comments: 1) The study clearly needs to be compared with the previous paper published on Gut by Barbara et al from which the results differ significantly. In that paper a reduced percentage of Enterobacteriaceae and Akkermansia was detected in SUDD, while increased level of Bacteroides was seen in SUDD patients. Authors should comment more in depth differences between their and Barbara’s work(some discussion is indeed present in the current version), including: different techniques used in the experiments, expected differences if they had tested faeces + mucosal biopsies and why other types of microbes such as Akkermansia and bacteroides were not analysed 2) Authors should discuss about methodological limitations, in particular the small sample size and the lack of strict matching between cases and controls (age, sex, habits), since



**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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

controls and cases were just 'consecutive' patients referred for colonoscopy