

## **Manuscript 69368-Answers to Reviewer's comments**

Each reviewer's comment has been addressed and the text changed accordingly. The modified text has been highlighted in red in the revised version of the manuscript as required.

We thank all the reviewers for the comments and we feel they significantly contributed to clarify important points of our work. The revised version of the manuscript has gained in clarity and we believe that it now fulfills the requirements for publication in the World Journal of Clinical Cases.

Thank you very much.

### **Point-by-point reply to Reviewers' comments**

#### **Reviewer #1:**

**Q1.** Survey contents should include race, genetic examination, smoking, drinking, education, etc...

**A1.** In our study we considered different variables, in line with those of others, including smoking. The data considered by us can be an eligible representation of the epidemiological and clinical characteristics of UC not only of the Sardinian population, but in general of the Italian one. On the other hand, the race of patients enrolled is rather homogeneous and would not have made significant contributions. Conversely, regarding the genetic differences in the patient cohort, this aspect is certainly interesting but very vast and heterogeneous and could be the subject of future research.

**Q2.** " Was this study performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki? Was the opt-out performed properly based on the ethical guidelines for observational studies? Please describe these firmly.

**A2.** The study performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. The ethics committee (protocol number reported in the manuscript) checked, through periodic meetings, that all phases of the study, from enrollment to the drafting of the work, took place according to the rules

**Q2.** The methods should be described separately for each item

**A2.** We made the changes in accordance with the suggestions

**Q3.** There are many misspellings of words, so proofreading is required.

**A3.** We did it accordingly and made the requiring changes

**Reviewer #2:** I appreciate the efforts put into this by the Author and co-authors of this publication. It was an exciting read. In addition to the extra work done by the authors and co-authors, I would like to suggest some changes needed. These changes will not affect the scientific interpretation of your results. But needs to be done before publishing

We thank for the positive comments.