PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 86286

Title: Comparison of fecal calprotectin and endoscopic score for predicting relapse of ulcerative colitis in remission

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00058403

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-19 14:03

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-19 15:44

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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

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 [Y] 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

Retrospective cohort study with a relevant topic, but in need of revision of the text, and highlight the following considerations: The keywords do not seem to cover the main points of the paper, the acronyms are also not very familiar. I suggest a review here. When they describe in the objectives "The secondary outcome was the association between endoscopic scores and biomarkers in enrolled patients with UC with mucosal healing." wouldn't it be a better biomarker, since they only use FC? Does the conclusion answer this secondary objective? Not even in the short title FC is contemplated

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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

3

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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] 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

Dear Sir, It as an utmost pleasure reading your research and it is a topic of interest as there a need to search for a specific reliable test for follow-up these patients. It is a real need to have good prognostic markers in order to predict the possibility of disease relapse as you stated. However, your main limitation is   related to your retrospective methodology, as well as the small sample you included. The only step you did not made clear is related to how you propose your work could be replicated in the future, or how you are planning a future research regarding your results in order to have a future progression of a probable prognostic predisposing relapse factor, that could be more useful. Other than that I want to congratulate you. Sincerely