

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78262
Title of the Manuscript:	Perioperative Use Of Vedolizumab In Crohn's Disease Patients And Surgical outcoms
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The use of the English language is quite poor and impairs optimal reading of the manuscript. 2. In the paragraph `Evidence of the perioperative consequences of vedolizumab` the authors state the conclusions at the beginning of the paragraph before even showing the data, which decreases the motivation of the reader. Besides these conclusions belong in the `Conclusions` paragraph at the end of the manuscript. 3. The description of the studies included might be more detailed, if possible, regarding the characteristics of CD, Montreal classification, complications etc... 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors may pay more attention to differences in working mechanism between different biologic agents mentioned in the manuscript in the paragraph `Pathophysiology`, given the fact that most studies cited compared Vedolizumab treated patients to anti-TNF treated and/or Ustekinumab treated patients. What is the difference and why is it relevant? 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The subject of the review is clinical relevant and therefore important that the review is readable and covering all the relevant information on the subject. 	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Carmen S Horjus</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Rijnstate Hospital Arnhem, Netherlands</i>