

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 40814

Title: Practical fecal calprotectin cut-off value for Japanese patients with ulcerative colitis

Reviewer's code: 00812852

Reviewer's country: Iran

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-07-10

Date reviewed: 2018-07-10

Review time: 2 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article has some merit but several points needs to be clarified: How did you select that 50 patients who underwent colonoscopy? What was the reason? The reference for all of the scoring systems should be given. What is the meaning of segmental colitis in patients with UC? This is either partially treated , CD or undetermined colitis and



**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
https:// www.wjgnet.com

probably should have been excluded . Theoretically relation between albumin and FC should have been reverse. In table 3 CRP is higher in non relapsed . Very unlikely Although the concept of deep (histologic) mucosal healing is well accepted in CD but the evidence in UC is not that strong. The difference should be mentioned .

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 40814

Title: Practical fecal calprotectin cut-off value for Japanese patients with ulcerative colitis

Reviewer's code: 02549032

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-07-26

Date reviewed: 2018-07-27

Review time: 21 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting one center retrospective cross sectional study on fecal calprotectin cut-off values for predicting ulcerative colitis activity in Japanese patients. The authors found no difference between fecal calprotectin to other traditional biomarkers such as CRP and ESR in predicting endoscopic and histologic remission in UC. They also found



**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
https:// www.wjgnet.com

higher cut-off values than previous studies in predicting relapse (for histologic remission cut off is less than 125µg/g. The study is interesting for publication however some minor issues. 1. In figures 2 A,B,C the specificity is always less than 40% (the horizontal axis). Why in the text the authors reported specificity 62% (Fig 2A), 70% in fig 2B, 71% in fig 2C? 2. What explanation is given of higher cut-off values than other studies? And How they explain no superiority of fecal calprotectin to traditional biomarkers such as CRP in predicting remission in UC?

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 40814

Title: Practical fecal calprotectin cut-off value for Japanese patients with ulcerative colitis

Reviewer's code: 00070062

Reviewer's country: Romania

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-07-26

Date reviewed: 2018-08-12

Review time: 17 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article presents retrospectively the value of fecal protectin in 131 patients , and only 50 were assessed endoscopically and histologically. Which were the criteria for performing endoscopy? Results are interesting, but there is no discussion on the interaction with other inflammatory markers. A multivariate analysis of the predictive



**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
https:// www.wjgnet.com

factors would be helpful, too. The rate of relapse is quite high 14% for 6 months of follow-up. Please explain. In discussion section there is a phrase "Our present study showed that a MES of 0 is associated with a lower risk of relapse and colectomy than a MES of 1 [21,22]. " Please rectify. The value of FC=175 can orientate towards a possible relapse, but the sensitivity and specificity are below 70%, this seems not a good test. This should be underlined in the conclusion.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No