

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 84451

Title: Azathioprine Monotherapy withdrawal in Inflammatory Bowel Diseases: A

Retrospective Mono-centric Study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03009698

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-27

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-01 03:37

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-01 09:17

Review time: 5 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	



Baishideng

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	 [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper performed a retrospective monocentric study aiming to evaluate azathioprine monotherapy withdrawal in inflammatory bowel diseases. I enjoyed reading this paper. However, there are some problems to be resolved. 1. I would strongly suggest that the author evaluate the recurrence rate of CD and UC after AZA suspension separately, instead of evaluating the recurrence rate of IBD. 2. Please add a section where potential clinical implications of these findings in real world clinical practice are presented. Moreover, please also discuss the limitations of this study. 3. English should be improved.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 84451

Title: Azathioprine Monotherapy withdrawal in Inflammatory Bowel Diseases: A

Retrospective Mono-centric Study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02441180

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: South Korea

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-27

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-07 02:10

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-14 12:56

Review time: 7 Days and 10 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation
uno munuocript	[] Grade D. No creativity of innovation



Baishideng

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [Y] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manusript entitled Azathioprine Monotherapy Withdrawal in Inflammatory Bowel Diseases: A Retrospective Monocentric Study was reviewed and considered there is no new remarkable fact in this research. For advanced evidence, prospective research could be neeeded as outcomes after withdrawal of AZA after long term remission of IBD. Thanks.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 84451

Title: Azathioprine Monotherapy withdrawal in Inflammatory Bowel Diseases: A

Retrospective Mono-centric Study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05562008

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Australia

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-27

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-08 01:08

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-17 19:48

Review time: 9 Days and 18 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [<mark>Y</mark>] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	 [] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a nice study which tries to address an unanswered question but with a small number of patients. I would suggest using the word cessation rather than suspension through out the paper. (suspension implies something temporary) Aim: We described the events that led to and following the cessation of AZA in IBD Under Materials and Methods to define your cohort: We selected IBD patients aged >18 years who were already on AZA or started then discontinued AZA monotherapy. (this takes into account som eof your data that you presented for the <18 year old) 3rd Paragraph under Materials and Methods. Sentence to restructure : All patients were assessed every six months in our outpatients clinic or earlier when needed using clinical and laboratory parameters. Under results the 69 patients that were in remission that AZA was stopped is a crucial group. How long was this group in sustained remission Figure 1 - Is it showing patients that were started or remained on Azathioprine? the body and discussion implies started the legend says remained. It is somewhat surprising before 2011 the use of Azathioprine was low Discussion IBD is an inflammatory disease of the gastrointestinal tract with a chronic intermittent course. 2nd paragraph 2nd line



consistent with published data regarding the efficacy... However we found a higher percentage of CD patients started AZA before 18 years when compared to UC patients.

At the end of paragraph 2 I would include anti TNF together with vedlizumab and ustekinumab Paragraph 4 and table 2 don't seem to correlate. Your criteria in Table 2 says ALT X2?? Myelosuppression in your table says 8.4% in the discussion you say 9.9%

At the end of the discussion you have quoted a very low relapse rate in your cohort which is a crucial outcome in your study. You will need to hypothesise why - maybe data of how long these 69 patients were in remission before stopping may shed some light. Your study is much smaller compared to the other 2 studies (N when it comes to sustained remission n=69 vs =237 and 215) and that limitation must be highlighted.