

Reviewer Comments:

Reviewer #1:

Specific Comments to Authors: Dear Sir, It as an utmost pleasure reading your research and it is a topic of interest as there a need to search for a specific reliable test for follow-up these patients. It is a real need to have good prognostic markers in order to predict the possibility of disease relapse as you stated. However, your main limitation is related to your retrospective methodology, as well as the small sample you included. The only step you did not made clear is related to how you propose your work could be replicated in the future, or how you are planning a future research regarding your results in order to have a future progression of a probable prognostic predisposing relapse factor, that could be more useful. Other than that I want to congratulate you. Sincerely

Response

We are very grateful to the referees for reviewing our manuscript.

We are also very pleased that our manuscript was well received.

Based on the reviewer's suggestion, we have added a statement to the discussion

section regarding the possible contribution of our research (Line 278, Page 12–
Line 280, Page 13).

Intensifying treatment based on the UCEIS score in real-world clinical practice
may contribute to the prevention of relapse; hence, further prospective studies are
desired.

Reviewer #2:

*Specific Comments to Authors: Retrospective cohort study with a relevant topic,
but in need of revision of the text, and highlight the following considerations:*

*The keywords do not seem to cover the main points of the paper, the acronyms
are also not very familiar. I suggest a review here.*

Response

We are very grateful to the referees for their review of our manuscript and their
advice.

Accordingly, we have corrected the description of the keywords.

When they describe in the objectives "The secondary outcome was the association between endoscopic scores and biomarkers in enrolled patients with UC with mucosal healing." wouldn't it be a better biomarker, since they only use FC? Does the conclusion answer this secondary objective? Not even in the short title FC is contemplated

Response

We are very grateful to the reviewers for their comments. This may be a misleading point, but this study conclusively argues that the endoscopic score is more useful in predicting relapse than the biomarker fecal calprotectin. Therefore, we did not include FC in the short title, and we discussed the usefulness of UCEIS in the conclusion. As the reviewer has pointed out, the secondary outcome needs to be corrected, hence the revision from "association" to "comparison" (Line 156, Page 7).