



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 45080

Title: Two-year delay in ulcerative colitis diagnosis is associated with anti-tumor necrosis factor alpha use

Reviewer's code: 02917331

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ruo-Yu Ma

Date sent for review: 2018-12-11

Date reviewed: 2018-12-14

Review time: 4 Hours, 3 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this paper entitled "Two-year delay in ulcerative colitis diagnosis is associated with anti-TNF α use", the authors evaluated the correlation between diagnosis delay and prognosis in ulcerative colitis (UC) patients. This is an interesting retrospective cohort



**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

study. A few comments are raised as follows. Major comments 1. One hundred sixty-seven cases were excluded from the analysis. Approximately one quarter of patients were excluded from analysis. This is a crucial bias. The authors should discuss in the limitations. 2. This study contains multiple analysis. These analysis seems to be multiple testing. Please discuss in the limitations. Minor comment In Table 2, 24 months row, total number of patients is different. Please check it.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No