



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 33886

**Title:** Determinants of relapse in ulcerative colitis patients: a pilot prospective cohort study

**Reviewer's code:** 03262333

**Reviewer's country:** Iran

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-11

**Date reviewed:** 2017-03-19

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 checked="" 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"/> 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is of interest but several points needs clarification: As this is a pilot study the sample size and the recruitment strategy are not well described It is not clear from how many patients this group was selected It is interesting no one in this group did ot use biologic treatment The baseline data on clinical and endoscopic severity index were not provided The multi regression analysis is not provided . For instance it seems older , over-weights were protected from relapse . Which one was the major factor? I recommend this paper to be published as a brief report after revision.



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 33886

**Title:** Determinants of relapse in ulcerative colitis patients: a pilot prospective cohort study

**Reviewer's code:** 02439990

**Reviewer's country:** France

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-11

**Date reviewed:** 2017-03-22

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

This is a prospective pilot study which assessed a number of factors able to predict relapse in UC patients followed during a 12-month period. The study is well conducted and the authors identified factors which have not been previously reported using urinary and serum metabolomics profiling. The results are clear and the discussion is well documented. This pilot study deserves to be repeated in a larger cohort of patients. Minor point Page 8, line 34. Please add "In" at the beginning of the sentence: "Another recent study"



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 33886

**Title:** Determinants of relapse in ulcerative colitis patients: a pilot prospective cohort study

**Reviewer's code:** 00049433

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-11

**Date reviewed:** 2017-03-29

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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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**

This is a nice piece of pilot work looking at predictors of relapse in UC patients. I have a few comments: Intro: please add an aim/hypothesis to the end of the introduction  
 Methods: 1. Is a Mayo <3 enough of an inclusion criteria? 2. Is two weeks off steroids enough to stay that the patient is truly in clinical remission? 3. Were eligible patients recruited consecutively - if not then significant selection bias may have occurred 4. Although the FFQ is validated in cancer patients, has it been validated in IBD? And is there not likely to be recall issues when asking people about their diet over a 12 month period? 5. Although this is clearly a pilot project I have some concerns about the conclusions drawn on these numbers. Given the number of hypotheses this study was testing, were all p values corrected for multiple testing (I don't believe so reading the manuscript). I suspect if not, then many of these "positive" results may not be truly positive. For example testing FCP, weight, medications, metabolites etc on only 20 patients is very likely to produce false positive results. I think a power calculation for



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

this study is required, if only to show the reader that this pilot is underpowered.  
Discussion: this seems very long and needs significantly shortened