



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14358

Title: Updates in vaccination: Recommendations for adult inflammatory bowel disease patients

Reviewer’s code: 00051581

Reviewer’s country: Canada

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-09-29 19:50

Date reviewed: 2014-10-21 01:18

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major Comments The authors have written a review article on a much needed topic surrounding the recommendations for vaccinations in adult patients with IBD. The manuscript is very comprehensive and detailed in its scope. The tables at the end of the manuscript are well constructed and valuable. With some edits, I believe this manuscript will be of value to the readership. Major comments from my perspective surround the length of the manuscript. I feel that the manuscript is very detailed, and at times somewhat redundant. Perhaps some of the redundancies stem from the two separate sections on vaccine recommendations in the general population, and then another discussion in the IBD population. I agree that both these pieces are important to highlight the context and the differences; however, I believe that the general section should be streamlined for essential points further. Table 6 is of particular interest. When considering live vaccines, most live vaccines are contraindicated between 1-3 months prior to immunosuppressive agents. It is often impractical to wait this time frame prior to starting definitive treatment. How do the authors suggest dealing with the timing of delivering live vaccines and balancing the vaccines with disease control? Minor



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

Comments 1. In the section on pneumococcal vaccines, what are the clinical differences between PPSV23 vaccine and PCV 13 vaccine? What are the indications for the PCV 13? What is the rationale for mentioning the PCV 13 vaccine? 2. Page 2, Pneumococcal Vaccine and IBD: change to : “Melmed et al. compared serological responses to PPSV23 in 21 IBD patients on combined immunomodulator and biologic therapy to 25 non-immunosuppressed patients.” 3. In the Hepatitis B vaccine section, please clarify Engerix, and what that entails 4. In the “special situations such as pregnancy, household contacts etc section”, the following statement is not clear “If the vaccinated household contact a rash develops after a live vaccine such as varicella, standard contact precautions should be observed.” Please reword such that this statement grammatically flows better the main points are conveyed



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14358

Title: Updates in vaccination: Recommendations for adult inflammatory bowel disease patients

Reviewer's code: 00037018

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-09-29 19:50

Date reviewed: 2014-10-14 18:38

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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 review article discusses recommendation for adult IBD patients vaccination protocols. While this is an interesting topic, there are some limitations in this study. Major points: for some vaccines (e.g., PPV, HPV), the authors mentions commercial products. Why not for all vaccines? Do authors mention commercial products available just in US or in all countries? When the authors mention a commercial vaccine, is this presentation comprehensive or some vaccines commercially available have been excluded. More details should be provided. The abstract should present general conclusion and not just indicate the contents of the review. For examples, is it true that for most vaccines, the use of TNF-a biologic inhibitor or the combination therapy limits the success of the procedure? The paragraph special situations seems somewhat superficial to this reviewer: just one reference is cited in all the paragraph. The indication for pregnant woman reported to not seem special for the IBD population. Have any study been performed about vaccination in IBD pregnant patients? Can the authors provide more details on studies about traveling IBD patients and their vaccination? Minor points: in the abstract the author mention that "IBD patients tend to be under



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

immunized": why? More details on this sentence should be provided in the abstract and introduction of the paper. In the introduction the authors mention that "even if response is suboptimal in some cases, it may still be sufficient to render immunity": this sentence is not very clear, what is the definition of suboptimal? Lines 94-96 stat that "for a subset of adults including immunocompromised IBD patients, at least one dose of PCV13 is recommended to be included in their vaccination regimen": why is that? Please provide more details. Please check for typos lines 155-157 (missing verb?). Lines 313-314: erase "geometric mean titers" Line 367: erase "inflammatory bowel disease" Line 430: change "seeks" with "seek" Line 449: change p-value to 0.24 Lines 579-583: move to subsequent paragraph. Line 608: please change "a rash develops" with "develops a rash"



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14358

Title: Updates in vaccination: Recommendations for adult inflammatory bowel disease patients

Reviewer's code: 00039316

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-09-29 19:50

Date reviewed: 2014-10-14 02:13

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

Nice comprehensive review. I recommend to delete tables 2-5, 8 since they are irrelevant to the topic. Explain all abbreviations in the tables legends. Disclose your conflict of interest. Author contribution and running head are missing. At least 1.5 line spacing and insertion of pages numbers facilitate reviewing