

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 44687

**Title:** Natural history of children with mild Crohn's disease

**Reviewer's code:** 01557050

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Ruo-Yu Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-01-29 07:19

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-02-03 23:23

**Review time:** 5 Days and 16 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" 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

1) General comments Dr. Sharma and Dr. Bousvaros, et al. investigated 'The natural history of children with mild Crohn's disease treated without immunomodulators or biologics'. The article is informative and well-presented. The reviewer has some comments. Comments 1) Please insert page numbers. 2) In Results, page 3 line 31

and Table 1, the authors describe inflammatory disease or inflammatory. CD is one of the inflammatory diseases, please explain the definition of inflammatory disease or inflammatory in Methods. 3) In Results, the authors describe Z score. Please explain the definition of Z score in Methods. 4) In Results, page 4 line 8 to 9 and Table 4, the authors describe both immunomodulators and immune suppressive therapies. Are these the same meanings in this study? The authors should explain the list of immunomodulators, including biological therapies? Because in Discussion, page 7 line 8, the authors describe 'immunomodulators or biologics'. 5) In Table 4, in 'Duration of follow up after initial 2 years treatment (months)', the authors use 'mo' in 2 patients in 2008. Please correct these.

## 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:** 44687

**Title:** Natural history of children with mild Crohn's disease

**Reviewer's code:** 00503587

**Reviewer's country:** New Zealand

**Science editor:** Ruo-Yu Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-01-31 06:55

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-02-07 07:16

**Review time:** 7 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

This MS focuses on the outcomes of a group of children with CD who were classified as having mild CD. SPECIFIC COMMENTS 1. The concluding comments in the ABSTRACT refer to QOL. While this may be true, the authors have not examined this aspect and can not state this as a conclusion 2. The methods of the ABSTRACT does not

refer to the control group at all. The text of the abstract is repeated word for word in some subsequent sections 3. The abbreviation CD should be explained in standard fashion initially and then used consistently thereafter 4. The authors use the term mild and limited CD. While they subsequently acknowledge that this term is not clearly defined, the nature of this work is such that a definition (even a working definition) is required. Subsequently, the authors mention that patients with mild CD may have growth impairment - this seems contradictory 5. The term 'CD patients' should be "patients with CD" 6. Other risk factors of escalation could be considered: disease activity scores at diagnosis, vitamin D status at diagnosis and subsequently. 7. The first part of the RESULTS section repeats the definition of the control group un-necessarily. This first part of the RESULTS also compares outcome without a p value. Unhelpful comparisons may be able to be mentioned only in the Table (avoid repetition) 8. The second part of the RESULTS mentions that the shortest followup (from diagnosis is mentioned) was only 1 month. This would not enable inclusion in the study group if correct. Should be revised to be more clear 9. Several parts of the RESULTS illustrate the outcomes for the study group but make no mention of the control group. These comparative data would enhance the MS 10. The section about ileal disease refers to a demoninator of 29: however earlier it was advised that many of the group had isolated colonic disease 11. The RISK study needs a reference 12. Bacterial names need to be formatted correctly 13. The DISCUSSION refers (for the first time) to the duration of antibiotic usage - this should be mentioned prior 14. The word "macroscopic" is used incorrectly. Earlier indeterminate colitis should be replaced with IBDU 15. References are incomplete (see author instructions) 16. Figure 1 could be improved with a better title. Also, is 70% correct - the figure suggests 30% only. Further, has the word probability been used correctly here? 17. Is the data in Table 2 related to the first two years after DIAGNOSIS? Needs to be more clear 18.



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

#### INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

##### *Google Search:*

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

##### *BPG Search:*

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