PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 75184

Title: Epidemiology of inflammatory bowel diseases in the state of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02462498

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-19 14:48

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-21 16:31

Review time: 2 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments to the Authors: I have reviewed the manuscript submission No.75184 entitled "Epidemiology of inflammatory bowel diseases in the state of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil" with interest. In this article, the authors stated that this is the first study with estimated incidence and prevalence rates of inflammatory bowel diseases in the state of RS between 2014 to 2019. I found that the value of this study is important. Besides, there are some concerns given to the authors as follows: 1. Overall, this article firstly reported epidemiological studies of IBD in the state of RS. However, there are still some possible bias in the results, since the authors regarded the age that the patients begin to receiving the free specialty drugs (from Farmácia de Medicamentos Especializados, FME) as their onset age. In fact, some patients may not afford the treatment. This limitation should be emphasized in the discussion.   2. In the section of materials and methods, the authors said that this study assessed the population of RS including the diagnosis of disease, date of treatment initiation, sex, age, skin color, city and region of residence, and type of drug used, whereas the details of drug use are not shown anywhere.   3. As an observation study in a large scale, the objects of analysis in the part of results is too simple, more elements should be included and analyzed to improve the quality of this study, such as the efficacy of these drugs, the outcome of disease, the incidence of complications (intestinal fistula, etc.), even the potential risk factors of IBD in RS area.   4. There are some typos and statistical errors. Firstly, in the abstract, "of which 57.5% were female and 42.5% were female" and "Crohn disease" in the key words. Secondly, in the results, "out of all patients with IBD, 622 (57.5%) were female and 460 (52.5%) were male". Considering that this article is an observation study including some quite simple

statistical analysis, the authors should confirm the accuracy and authority of these data in this paper before publishing online. Please scrutinize carefully before resubmission. 5. The resolution of these figures is low, especially annotation of Y-axis in figure 3. Authors should try to change the method of making figure.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Title. Yes   2 Abstract. Some errors: Please delete Both entities have the same characteristics of progression and similar therapeutic responses but should be considered 2 different diseases. This is incorrect.   What is meant by analytic study? Please delete: Findings with P ≤ 0.05 were considered statistically significant. P Value has not been used in abstract   57.5% were female and 42.5% were female: Check Change conclusion to one which only talks about the present report and not 'other publication' 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? YES 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes, Briefly mention in which part of Brazil is this state 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes: 6 Results.: The gender figures in results donot match with abstract and is >100%   Since the pharmacy covers 70% of population, how was prevalence calculated   The results are minimalistic   7 Discussion. is very long and unfocused. This has to be sortened and the focus should only be to compare with other sites in Brazil and with developed world.   The discussion about gender is not needed   8 Illustrations and tables. OK   9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Unclear. Must explain the calculations   10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? OK   11 References. References are ok   12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Discussion should be made brief 13 STROBE Checklist is provided   14 Ethics statements: Provided