



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 79725

Title: Knowledge and attitudes towards the use of histological assessments in ulcerative colitis by gastroenterologists versus pathologists

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 00503545

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Director, Doctor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Japan

Author’s Country/Territory: Australia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-11

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-15 10:36

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-19 04:34

Review time: 3 Days and 17 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

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

In this paper, the authors evaluated the knowledge of histology guidelines and attitudes towards the use of histology in UC by gastroenterologists and pathologists. They concluded that histological remission is a recognised target for both gastroenterologists and pathologists but this, knowledge of histological scoring systems and their utilisation is poor. The theme of the study is interesting, and the paper is well written. However, the authors should address the following points. Major 1. As the authors also described in the section of discussion, it is suggested that the numbers of the responders, especially those of pathologists, were too small to correctly evaluate the theme of the study. In addition, according to Table 1, it seems that there is heterogeneity in the highest level of education between the gastroenterologists and pathologists. It appears that the rate of the included gastroenterologists that actively saw IBD patients in daily clinical practice (>10 patients each week) is somewhat small. Minor 1. I would recommend that the Geboes Score, Nancy Index and Robarts Histopathological Index scoring systems are briefly shown in the text. 2. The authors described that “We would, therefore, recommend a unified scoring system to be used in the section discussion (p11, line 12-13)”. I suggest that the authors explain this more specific.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 79725

Title: Knowledge and attitudes towards the use of histological assessments in ulcerative colitis by gastroenterologists versus pathologists

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03198793

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Physician, Dean, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Australia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-11

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-07 15:14

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-13 11:22

Review time: 5 Days and 20 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" 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
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

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 study assessed the knowledge and attitudes of gastroenterologists and pathologists towards histological assessment in UC, and found that their knowledge of histological scoring systems and their utilization of the histological scoring system were very low. This study may draw more attention from the expert in gastroenterology and pathology to these histological scoring systems. My comments as follows: 1. It is more important to discuss why they know little about these score systems and why they did not use them. How accurate or consistent are these scoring systems used to evaluate histological features? 2. Besides, there are a lot of reiteration description of the results in the discussion.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 79725

Title: Knowledge and attitudes towards the use of histological assessments in ulcerative colitis by gastroenterologists versus pathologists

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03976790

Position: Editor-in-Chief

Academic degree: DSc, PhD

Professional title: Emeritus Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: France

Author's Country/Territory: Australia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-11

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-09 07:26

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-15 18:55

Review time: 6 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" 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

Comments on the manuscript: “Knowledge and attitudes towards the use of histological assessments in ulcerative colitis by gastroenterologists versus pathologists” Histological remission is accepted as a treatment criterion in the management of ulcerative colitis (UC). However, the level of knowledge of the histological guidelines by gastroenterologists and pathologists and their use are not known. The aim of the work presented here was to assess the knowledge of histological guidelines and the use of histology by gastroenterologists and pathologists in the particular case of ulcerative colitis, in Australia. For this, the authors carried out a national survey of gastroenterologists and pathologists. The survey included questions to assess the knowledge of gastroenterologists and histopathologists and their attitudes towards histological analysis. The questionnaire was built and adapted to ulcerative colitis from other questionnaires from various countries and concerning several other pathologies. I found this work interesting, useful and can serve as a model for other evaluations of the same type in the world. However, I have a few remarks to make and a few questions to ask before considering the publication of this manuscript. Reading the text, it appears that this study focused on the practice of histopathology in the case of ulcerative colitis in Australia. It seems to me that this should be announced from the title of the article and clarified in a more marked way in “Study cohort”: “Gastroenterologists were contacted by proxy through the Gastroenterological Society of Australia”, does not mean that all gastroenterologists contacted through the society all practice in Australia. Page 6. “...that aligned with the ECCO position paper on histopathology and the BSG reporting guidelines on IBD biopsies.”: a reference would be useful. Page 8. For the



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

“Geboes score...”, “Nancy index”, “Robarts histopathology index “: references to these indexes would be useful, especially for readers who are not familiar with these indexes. Page 15, table 1: I have only a remark: this table is interesting and gives a good panel of cohort. Nevertheless, it is specific to Australia. In other countries, the exercise of medicine needs to be medical doctor (M.D.), different from a bachelor in medicine or surgery, or a master, or PhD. If other researchers wish to establish comparisons, it will be necessary to establish equivalences (when possible) between the diplomas and the functions. Of course, no correction is requested but a few words indicating this question could be given in the text, so as to open up this work to other countries.