



**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>

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34916

Title: Time to clinical response and remission for therapeutics in inflammatory bowel diseases: What should the clinician expect, what should patients be told?

Reviewer's code: 00004011

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-06-06

Date reviewed: 2017-06-07

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a very interesting and well written review



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34916

Title: Time to clinical response and remission for therapeutics in inflammatory bowel diseases: What should the clinician expect, what should patients be told?

Reviewer's code: 03647086

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-06-06

Date reviewed: 2017-06-08

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript that provides the source for the time to the effect of every IBD treatment. I reviewed this manuscript with sincerity. The following comments/suggestions arose during my review. 1. In a review article, I believe that the basis and origin of each description should be clear. In table 2, the addition of the reference number for every row is highly recommended. 2. And in table 2, the meaning of "?" is not clear whether the literature as an evidence is absent or some literatures exist but those results are not constant. Authors may explain the reason of "?" in footnote, for instance, with a dagger symbol. 3. Also in table 3, the meanings of "?" and "-" are equivocal whether each parameter has the data which are inconsistent or has the data which shows no effect or has no data simply. Authors can explain in detail.



**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>

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34916

Title: Time to clinical response and remission for therapeutics in inflammatory bowel diseases: What should the clinician expect, what should patients be told?

Reviewer's code: 00069819

Reviewer's country: Jordan

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2017-06-06

Date reviewed: 2017-06-11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this narrative review the Authors comprehensively discuss the various therapies available for IBD, focusing on the time to clinical response. The manuscript is very well written and easy to read. I believe that this paper adds to our canon of knowledge of practical issues in IBD management, and will attract a large readership. May only comment/suggestion is that the Authors may need to specify what exactly they mean by "clinical response", as this could be considered as improvement in symptoms only, or improvement in symptoms and laboratory indices (e.g. ESR, CRP, fecal calprotectin,.....).