

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Major revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** This is a highly comprehensive review that summarizes the data in the literature. Unfortunately, the authors have bypassed the steps required to develop a systematic review. Ideally, these steps are followed (and published on a website) prior to embarking on the review. This allows a clear picture of the actual objectives of performing the review and the methods used for selecting the articles that were reviewed, including methods to determine the level of bias in the articles. The review, on the other hand, could be considered a "Critical Review of the Literature", which may or may not require a formal methodology to describe article selection. I suggest that the authors decide what type of review that they wish to publish prior to our complete evaluation of the manuscript. See this table and reference for further information Table 1. Checklist of items to include when reporting a systematic review (with or without meta-analysis).

Section/Topic	#	Checklist Item
Reported on	Page #	TITLE Title 1 Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.
ABSTRACT	Structured summary 2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.
INTRODUCTION	Rationale 3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.
Objectives 4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	
METHODS	Protocol and registration 5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.
Eligibility criteria 6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	
Information sources 7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	
Search 8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	
Study selection 9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	
Data collection process 10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	
Data items 11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	
Risk of bias in individual 12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies	

(including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis. Summary measures 13 State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means). Synthesis of results 14 Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g.,  $I^2$ ) for each meta-analysis. Risk of bias across studies 15 Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies). Additional analyses 16 RESULTS Study selection 17 Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified. Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. Study characteristics 18 For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations. Risk of bias within studies 19 Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome-level assessment (see Item 12). Results of individual 20 studies For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group and (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot. Synthesis of results 21 Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., health care providers, users, and policy makers). Risk of bias across studies 22 Additional analysis 23 DISCUSSION Summary of evidence 24 Limitations 25 Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). Conclusions 26 Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. FUNDING Funding 27 Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply Reference: The PRISMA Statement for Reporting Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses of Studies That Evaluate Health Care Interventions: Explanation and Elaboration

Reply: thank you very much for your comments. Respectfully, we prefer to perform a critical review of the literature rather than a systematic review since there is a large heterogeneity in studies with significant difference in classification, clinical and histological parameters, so that a direct comparison would be difficult. Indeed, in this review we have tried to present the different characteristics of colitis after kidney transplantation in order to present to readers a easy-to-read review which could be useful in the diagnosis and management of colitis after

kidney transplantation.

Reviewer #2:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Major revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** There is mismatch between the title and the material presented. A more appropriate title will be Diseases of the gut in post renal transplant patients or Gastrointestinal complications following renal transplantation. IBD refers to only UC and Crohn's disease.

Thank you for your comment. We have modified the title of the manuscript according to your suggestion.

These are very few and hence only limited description of those in this review.

I completely agree with the reviewer and a detailed review of IBDs in kidney transplantation was performed

On the other hand, a lot more space has been allocated to Graft vs host disease, MMF colitis , CMV colitis , none of which come within the ambit of IBD.

I agree with the reviewer, and for this reason the title was changed to Gastrointestinal complications after kidney transplantation, although the review is mainly devoted to post-transplant colitis

Secondly, all these non IBD diseases have been well described elsewhere in the literature. Hence that is not needed in this review. Instead , in it the authors should limit their review of these conditions only in reference to post renal transplant patients rather than a general description of these conditions.

I agree with the reviewer but, respectfully, the aim of this review is to give to readers a comprehensive view on post-transplant colitis in kidney transplantation, since to date there is no consensus on clinical and histological parameters and on treatment of post-transplant colitis.

## **Step 6: Editorial Office's comments**

The author must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which listed below:

**(1) *Science Editor*:** 1 Scientific quality: This is a review of the inflammatory bowel disease. The topic is within the scope of the WJG. (1) Classification: Grade B and Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: Reviewer#02440843 thinks this is a highly comprehensive review that summarizes the data in the literature. Unfortunately, the authors have bypassed the steps required to develop a systematic review.

thank you very much for your comments. Respectfully, we prefer to perform a critical review of the literature rather than a systematic review since there is a large heterogeneity in studies reported in literature, with significant difference in classification, clinical and histological parameters, so that a direct comparison would be difficult. Indeed, in this review we have tried to present the different characteristics of colitis after kidney transplantation in order to present to readers a easy-to-read review which could be useful in the diagnosis and management of colitis after kidney transplantation.

Reviewer#00009064 pointed out that discordance between the title and the substance of the review was a major problem.

The title was changed

The authors should limit their review of these conditions only in reference to post renal transplant patients rather than a general description of these conditions. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered.

We have answered to all reviewers' queries and revised the manuscript accordingly.

and (3) Format: There is 1 table and 1 figure. A total of 90 references are cited, including 9 references published in the last 3 years. The authors need to update the references. There are 5 self-citations.

Reference list was updated

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B and Grade C. The authors need to provide the language certificate of professional language company.

An Editing Language certification was uploaded

3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study was supported by the FIR 2014 Project, University of Catania. The topic has not previously been published in the WJG. The corresponding author has not published articles in the BPG. 5 Issues raised: (1) I found the language classification was grade C. Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies we recommend:  
<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>;

An Editing Language certification was uploaded

(2) I found the authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s);

a screenshot of the confirmation mail was uploaded.

I found the authors did not provide the original figures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor;

Figures were prepared according to your suggestions

(4) we suggest the authors change the manuscript type to "systematic review". If the authors agree to change the manuscript type, the authors need to adjust the format of manuscript according to the Guidelines and Requirements for "systematic review", and to provide the Biostatistics Review Certificate and PRISMA checklist form.

thank you very much for your suggestion. Respectfully, we prefer to perform a critical review of the literature rather than a systematic review since there is a large heterogeneity in studies reported in literature, with significant difference in classification, clinical and histological parameters, so that a direct comparison would be difficult. Indeed, in this review we have tried to present the different characteristics of colitis after kidney transplantation in order to present to readers a easy-to-read review which could be useful in the diagnosis and management of colitis after kidney transplantation.

6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

**(2) Editorial Office Director:** I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

**(3) Company Editor-in-Chief:** I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, the relevant ethics documents, and the English Language Certificate, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Thank you very much