

Response to the comments of reviewer and editor

We thank the reviewer for the positive assessment of our manuscript and for identifying areas that required corrections and/or modification. The red-colored text in the revised manuscript is the corrected/modified text. All line numbers mentioned in each response to each comment refer to the small-size numbers that appear on the left margin of the text of the revised manuscript.

Reviewer #1:

This study investigated the usefulness of the 10-7G value as a novel, potential serum biomarker for monitoring disease activity of IBD. By comparing 10-7G values with several conventional serum biomarkers, this study found out that positive 10-7G mAb staining was observed in the intestinal tissues of UC patients. Besides, 10-7G values were significantly higher in patients with UC, CD, and AE as compared to HVs. What's more, 10-7G values reflecting an inflammatory condition were correlated with CRP. Finally, with the analysis of ROC, 10-7G value is confirmed to be a useful biomarker for evaluating endoscopic mucosal healing in UC patients. It's a novel and interesting finding.

But, this paper still have some problems:

First, the flow chart of detection methods mentioned in this article was deficient, which was hard to understand the author's intention.

Thank you for the reviewer's valuable comment. According to the reviewer's comment, we added flow chart of detection methods (Figure 7) and some descriptions in our revised manuscript (line 450-6, 626).

Second, the number of patients with CD or UC with resected intestinal tissue sections undergoing immunohistochemistry testing was ambiguous respectively.

Thank you for the important comment. According to the reviewer's comment, we added the number of the patients with UC or CD with resected intestinal tissue

sections undergoing immunohistochemistry testing in revised manuscript (line 205, 587-93).

5 EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Science editor:

The flow chart of detection methods mentioned in this article was deficient, which was hard to understand the author's intention. The number of patients with CD or UC with resected intestinal tissue sections undergoing immunohistochemistry testing was ambiguous respectively.

Thank you for the reviewer's valuable comment. According to the reviewer's comment, we added flow chart of detection methods (Figure 7) and some descriptions in our revised manuscript (line 451-7, 666). In addition, according to the reviewer's comment, we added the number of the patients with UC or CD with resected intestinal tissue sections undergoing immunohistochemistry testing in revised manuscript (line 207, 628-32).

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. The authors need to provide the right language certificate, not the invoice.

We added a language certification file instead of the invoice.

3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Institutional Review Board Approval Form. The authors need to provide the Biostatistics Review Certificate, the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement,

and informed consent. The authors need to fill out the STROBE checklist with page numbers. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search.

Thank you for your comments. According to the comments, we added some files in revised manuscript.

4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study was supported by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science KAKENHI grant; and collaboration grant with FUJIFILM Wako Pure Chemical Corporation. The topic has not previously been published in the WJG. The corresponding author has not published articles in the BPG. 5 Issues raised: (1) I found the authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s);

We corrected the name of funding. The file about the collaboration grant with FUJIFILM Wako Pure Chemical Corporation is a confidential one, so we cannot add approved grant application form.

(2) I found the authors did not provide the original figures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.

We added original files of our manuscript.

(3) I found the authors did not write the “article highlight” section. Please write the “article highlights” section at the end of the main text. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

We added article highlight in our revised manuscript (line 465-505).