Answer to reviewer's comments

Comment #1: I read with great interest the paper by Baillet et al. It was aimed to assess the utility of MR enterography and faecal calprotectin to detect endoscopic POR of Crohn's disease. The subject is very interesting and up-to-date. It is of great importance to define how to monitor the postoperative course of CD in order to prevent disease recurrence. That is why in my opinion the submitted paper has a great practical relevance. The methodological aspects are well prepared and planned, as well as the statistical analysis. The discussion is interesting and clearly written. The authors also discuss the possible limitations of the study.

Answer #1: We thanks reviewer #1 for his/her encouraging comment.

Comment #2: In my opinion the papers deserves publication in WJGNET, however some revision should be done: 1. In Table 1 the authors present „baseline characteristics" of the study group. It is not clear, wheter this Table reffers to the time of surgery or the time of the control colonoscopy?

Answer #2: The characteristics reffer to the time of endoscopy. It has been clarified in the legend of Table 1 in the revised manuscript.

Comment #3: What was the exact time point for the enrollment to the study? Were the patients enrolled just after surgery and prospectively followed or the enrollment started at the time of the control colonoscopy?

Answer #3: The patients were enrolled just after surgery and prospectively followed.

Comment #4: 2. The study group was treated with different agents after the surgery. Please specify what are the algorithms in the centers represented by the authors in case of patients with CD undergoing surgery? Why some proportion of patients was treated aggressively with anti-TNF agents (what were the criteria for using anti-TNF agents?) and other patients received mesalamine, which is believed to have no influence (or very low influence) on the reccurence of CD after the surgery? Which patients received no medications?

Answer #4: The choice of medication to prevent postoperative recurrence was free and depended on the physician's decision. It has been added in the revised manuscript. We believe that this point is not very significant as we did not aim to assess the impact of therapy in this study. We aimed to assess the performances of MRI and fecal calprotectin to detect endoscopic postoperative recurrence regardless the treatment.

Comment #5: 3. Rutgeerts score was designed to assess the CD recurrence in patients after ileocolonic resection. In the study group 15 patients had pure ileal disease location and 1 patient presented with pure colonic location. What are the data for using this endoscopic score in patients with CD after other type surgery, than ileocolonic resection?

Answer #5: This patient had isolated colonic location but underwent ileocolonic resection.

Comment #5: 4. The authors perfomed the inter-observer agreement analysis in case of MRI studies. It would be interesting to have similar data in case of the interpretation of endoscopic images, since it was shown that the reproducibility of the Rutgeerts score is moderate, especially in differentiating between < i2 and ≥ i2. Please make a comment on that.

Answer #5: We thanks reviewer#1 for his/her comment. The endoscopic evaluations were performed by only one experienced IBD physician for each patient. Accordingly, we were unable to assess the inter-observer agreement.

Comment #6: 5. The authors are using MaRIA score and Clermont score, however it was not mentioned in the methods section how the authors calculated the scores. For example, MaRIA originally was designed also to assess CD colonic involvement in MRI by placing a rectal catheter and filling the colon with water. In the submitted paper, MR enterography was performed by using a standard protocol, without distending the colon before the examination. Thus, please specify how those indices were calculated in the present study.

Answer #6: These two scores were calculated according to previously published data. It has been added in the methods section of the revised manuscript. The MRI were performed with no bowel cleansing the day before and no colonic distension during the procedure as it is mentioned in the methods section.