

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 35272

**Title:** Efficacy of noninvasive biomarkers in monitoring inflammatory bowel disease activity: a prospective study in China

**Reviewer's code:** 00069819

**Reviewer's country:** Jordan

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2017-08-01

**Date reviewed:** 2017-08-03

**Review time:** 2 Days

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 study the Authors aimed to investigate the diagnostic efficacy of non-invasive biomarkers in monitoring IBD activity. The study is interesting, but not novel. Namely, I am afraid that it would add very little to what is already well established in the pertinent literature. The manuscript has major flaws: 1. The abstract is not well structured, and in particular, the methods and the results sections are too short. 2. The Authors aimed to study non-n biomarkers, but then they included the CDAI (which is a disease activity scoring system and not a biomarker). 3. The inclusion and exclusion criteria are not clear. 4. The sample size is too small to allow sufficient statistical power. 5. The discussion section should start by stating the main results of the study. The Authors should add a full paragraph explaining their results and their clinical significance. 6. The conclusions are weak.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 35272

**Title:** Efficacy of noninvasive biomarkers in monitoring inflammatory bowel disease activity: a prospective study in China

**Reviewer's code:** 02446483

**Reviewer's country:** Canada

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2017-08-20

**Date reviewed:** 2017-08-29

**Review time:** 8 Days

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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

Very interesting manuscript and very useful for clinicians, but reading the text there are some numbers and statements that need to be adequately revised. Please peruse all numbers (including statistics) again. Moreover, include as exclusion criterion also patients >85 years, am I correct?

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 35272

**Title:** Efficacy of noninvasive biomarkers in monitoring inflammatory bowel disease activity: a prospective study in China

**Reviewer's code:** 02441166

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2017-08-20

**Date reviewed:** 2017-09-02

**Review time:** 13 Days

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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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

The prospective study from Chen JM et al. on adult patients with IBD is aimed to assess efficacy of non-invasive biomarkers (FC, CDAI, CAI, CPR, ESR and PTC) for evaluation of disease activity in three categories of IBD patients: with colonic or ileocolonic Crohn's disease, with CD-related surgery, and with UC. Endoscopic scores were considered as gold standards. A control IBS group was also used. Finally, two equations were obtained with the multiple linear regression analysis to construct combined scores predicting the endoscopic activity in CD and UC. Abbreviations should be defined at the first mention in the text and not only in the abstract. The normality of data distribution was visually established with the Q-Q plot. Data distribution should be established with the Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Shapiro-Wilk test as appropriate (see SPSS explore section). Authors should explain where the Bonferroni adjustment was applied (usually as

post-hoc test in the case of gaussian data). In the statistical analysis section it should be detailed about the variables used in the two multivariate models. Moreover, multiple linear regression models should be summarized in a table showing the coefficients. The complex scores for CD and CD should be explained in detail. No data about IBS patients were cited in the text. All ROC curves should be showed as supplementary material. Reference 11 and 15 are the same.