



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 94490

Title: Aspergillus niger prolyl endopeptidase in celiac disease

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02842299

Position: Executive Associate Editor-in-Chief

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Chief Physician, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2024-03-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-03-31 14:49

Reviewer performed review: 2024-04-05 08:40

Review time: 4 Days and 17 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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



Scientific significance of the conclusion in 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 scientific significance
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

The editorial pointed out the shortcomings of the previous article. In the article by Stefanolo JP et al., the comparisons are not significant. Meanwhile, in this study was not tested the exposition to gluten. It's not clear whether the data would be different under a condition with normal amount of gluten. Additionally, it is crucial to increase the sample size of Stefanolo JP et al. in subsequent experiments. Despite examining 628 stool samples, only 37 patients actively participated in the study. For patient outcomes, are any patients still experiencing progression after treatment (refractory CeD)? Previous studies have highlighted that the activation of intraepithelial lymphocytes to eradicate epithelial cells is the underlying pathogenesis. Did the authors take into account this within the treatment group? In general, AN-PEP treatment as a pilot study gives us a help for searching other adjuvant therapies along GFD. Although there's still a lot to be done.