

POINT – TO – POINT REPLY TO REVIEWERS AND EDITOR

Ref. Manuscript n. 55958

We are pleased to inform you that, after preview by the Editorial Office and peer review as well as CrossCheck and Google plagiarism detection, we believe that the academic quality, language quality, and ethics of your Manuscript NO.: 55958 basically meet the publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology. As such, we have made the preliminary decision that it is acceptable for publication after your appropriate revision. Upon our receipt of your revised manuscript, we will send it for re-review. We will then make a final decision on whether to accept the manuscript or not based on the reviewers' comments, the quality of the revised manuscript, and the relevant documents.

Response: *we sincerely thank the Editor for his positive response and for the opportunity to revised the manuscript according to the suggestions.*

- (1) Scientific quality:** Please resolve all issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report and make a point-to-point response to the issues raised in the peer review report.

Response: *Changes have been made accordingly (see below).*

- (2) Language quality:** Please resolve all language issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report. Please be sure to have a native-English speaker edit the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, word usage, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, format, and general readability, so that the manuscript's language will meet our direct publishing needs.

Response: *the original manuscript has been drafted by the last author JKL, a native English speaker. He has also revised the final version, therefore no certificate has been produced.*

- (3) Special requirements for figures:**

Response: *no figures has been provided.*

- (4) Special requirements for tables:**

Response: *Two tables have been inserted in the actual version*

- (5) Special requirements for references:**

Response: *The PMDI and DOI have been added*

- (6) Special requirements for article highlights:** If your manuscript is an original study (basic study or clinical study), meta-analysis, systemic review, the “article highlights” section should be provided. Detailed writing requirements for “article highlights” can be found in the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision.

Response: *Not sure was needed, anyway the section highlights has been incorporated*

- (7) Ethical documents:**

Response: not applicable

- (8) Approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s):** If your manuscript has supportive foundations, the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s) must be provided.

Response: *The document of the funding Society (ESGH) has been added.*

Manuscript revision deadline

Response: *the revision has been submitted within 14 days.*

Verify the accuracy of general information for your manuscript

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO.: 55958

Column: Expert Consensus

Title: FIRST UNITED ARAB EMIRATES CONSENSUS ON DIAGNOSIS AND MANAGEMENT OF IBD: A 2020 Delphi Consensus

Authors: Mariam Alkhatry, Ahmad Al-Rifai, Vito Annese, Filippos Georgopoulos, Ahmad Najib Jazzar, Ahmed Mohammed Khassouan, Zaher Koutoubi, **Rahul Nathw**, Mazen Sayed Taha and Jimmi K Limdi

Comment: *Please note than another Author has been included – he was erroneously omitted in the previous version. I do apologize for that*

Corresponding author: Vito Annese, MD, PhD, Assistant Professor, Director, Consultant Gastroenterologist, Gastroenterology and Endoscopy, American Hospital,

Dubai, Dubai ., United Arab Emirates. vitoannese1@gmail.com

Received Date: 2020-04-16

First decision: 2020-05-01

Comment: *data are correct*

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: To the Authors The consensus paper named „ First United Arab Emirates consensus on diagnosis and management of IBD: a Delphi Consensus, written by Maryam Alkhatry et al. is very useful in daily practice, considering the increasing number of IBD patients and increased therapeutic options. Great efforts have been done, and a huge number of relevant references have been cited.

Response: *We sincerely thanks the Reviewer for his appreciation.*

The main objection is that the paper is not written systematically enough. The Introduction chapter contains the method used in the paper; however, it is necessary to present a more detailed description of the methods used in a separate chapter. It would be practical to have an index of individual parts of work. Diagnostic recommendations are written within the clinical picture description. Diagnostic methods are not listed in the usual order: laboratory tests, endoscopy, histology, imaging... I propose to separate the lists of therapy by disease (Crohn's, ulcerative colitis), and by the activity of the disease (induction, remission). Furthermore, the list of therapy can start with conventional therapy, followed by biologics and small molecules. Statement 107. is not explained enough. Sometimes the results of drug concentration and antibodies require a new drug, out of class.

Response: *We do agree with the reviewer, the first version submitted was not systematically reported because the text was basically following the statements and not viceversa. We have therefore followed the precious advices by: a) adding an index; b) move parts of the text as suggested to have a more structured flow of the information; c) expanded the comment to statement 107.*

Editorial Office's comments

Science Editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes the expert consensus of the inflammatory bowel disease. The topic is within the scope of the WJG. (1) Classification: Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The reviewer thinks this manuscript is very useful in daily practice. Great efforts have been done, and a huge number of relevant references have been cited.

Response: *thanks for your appreciation.*

The main objection is that the paper is not written systematically enough.

Response: *The manuscript has been modified accordingly*

The introduction chapter contains the method used in the paper; however, it is necessary to present *a more detailed description of the methods used in a separate chapter.*

Response: *a new para describing the methodology has been added*

Diagnostic recommendations are written within the clinical picture description.

Response: *The headline of the para has been modified in clinical picture and differential diagnosis.*

Format: There are no tables or figures. The authors need to add some figures or tables.

Response: *We have added 2 tables. No figures were deemed appropriate.*

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).

Response: *the document demonstrating the support of the Consensus made by the Emirates Society of gastroenterology and Hepatology has been produced.*

I found the authors did not add the PMID and DOI in the reference list.

Response: *PMID and DOI has been added in the new version. We apology for the missing.*

The reference numbers will be superscripted in square brackets at the end of the sentence with the citation content or after the cited author's name, with no spaces.

Response: *the style of references mention within the text has been modified.*

Editorial Office Director: I have checked the comments written by the science editor. The author uploaded the wrong document in the language certificate column.

Response: *No language certificate is needed being the manuscript drafted and reviewed by a native English authors (JKL).*

Company Editor-in-Chief: However, the quality of the English language of the manuscript does not meet the requirements of the journal. Before final acceptance, the author(s) must provide the English Language Certificate issued by a professional English language editing company. Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies we recommend: <https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>.

Response: *We respectfully believe that there is no need for Certificate of English Language, being the author who has drafted and reviewed the manuscript a native English speaker (JKL).*

Before final acceptance, the author(s) must add a table/figure to the manuscript.

Response: *A table has been added in the manuscript summarizing the percentage of agreement of different statements and supplementary table including all the statements.*

Revise the manuscript

Please update your manuscript according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision and the Format for Manuscript Revision for your specific manuscript type: 'Expert Consensus'.

Response: *we have formatted the manuscript accordingly.*

Submit the revised manuscript and all related documents

(1) 55958-Manuscript File^{[1][SEP]}(2) 55958-Answering Reviewers^{[1][SEP]}(3) 55958-Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form^{[1][SEP]}(4) 55958-Copyright License Agreement^{[1][SEP]}(5) 55958-Approved Grant Application Form(s) or Funding Agency Copy of any Approval Document

Response: *We have submitted the different files accordingly*

Dubai, May 20th, 2020

DR. Vito Annese

POINT-BY-POINT Revision 2

First of all we would like to thank the Editor and reviewers to allow to submit a revised version of the manuscript.

We have followed the list of issues to be addressed, checking all the single point and more specifically correcting the problem marked in red.

We have checked that all the abbreviations are defined at the first appearance

No language certification has been provided since the manuscript was drafted and revised by the last Author, Dr. Jimmy Limdi from UK (mother tongue).

The manuscript organization has been modified as suggested.

Authors and name affiliation has been modified and organized as listed at Query 8.

The Authors signature of copyright has been incorporated in a single page.

The Authors contributors has been corrected with the suggested format for the names.

The grant number has been added.

The Institution and address of the corresponding Authors has been included

The citation has been added as suggested

The core tip has been added

The format of references has been corrected by eliminating the spaces among numbers and after the last text word

The Table has been moved at the end of manuscript on a separate page with three-line space

The only supplementary table has been moved in another file.