

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 90763

Title: Real-world efficacy and safety of tofacitinib treatment in Asian patients with ulcerative colitis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05395205

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Postdoc

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2024-01-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-01-10 13:36

Reviewer performed review: 2024-01-10 13:45

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study the authors investigate the long-term efficacy and safety of TOF treatment for UC. Some suggestions are listed as below: Why week 8 and week 48 were selected as outcomes in this study? Safety data should be provided. Why these patients with UC were treated with TOF, rather than other treatments. Potential selection bias should not be ignored. Had this study been registered before?