

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7147

Title: Epidemiology, demographic characteristics and prognostic predictors of ulcerative colitis

Reviewer code: 00181118

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2013-11-06 17:06

Date reviewed: 2013-12-17 02:04

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript deal an interesting topic regard prognostic predictors in ulcerative colitis (UC). The topic of prognostic factors in UC particularly in term of risk for surgery is interesting for both gastroenterologists and colorectal surgeons. I have the following comments: 1. The manuscript is a narrative review and not a systematic review, without a grade of evidence. For any risk factor identified who is related to the outcome it should be done a systematic review with a study diagram and an outline of how many articles were found from the initial search, how many and why were certain articles excluded. A systematic review gives a better overall view of the literature and permits to better understand the usefulness of the information and the grade of evidence. 2. The fist part of the manuscript concerning the epidemiologic, pathogenic and environmental aspects is not strictly connected to the topic of the manuscript and in my opinion can be omitted. 3. The conclusions are very poor, I think in this section it should be emphasize which are the most important predictors of prognosis and the usefulness of those information in the management of patients with U.C.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7147

Title: Epidemiology, demographic characteristics and prognostic predictors of ulcerative colitis

Reviewer code: 00074163

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2013-11-06 17:06

Date reviewed: 2014-01-15 21:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article is very well written and has very thorough reviewed the different parts of UC when it comes to epidemiology, demographic and prognostic factors and predictors in UC. The authors have very thoroughly covered the most important areas and have described earlier research in a clear and readable way. It is an important article that may help in the clinical world. The title is clear and accurately reflects the topic of the article. The abstract may need some more work. The aim could be more direct (as in the article). I also miss Method and Conclusion. In the article there is no Method. It would be nice to have information about how the review has been conducted. If the authors have been searching for articles at Pub-med or similar and if that is the case - what have the authors used as keywords? Has there been any limitations in the search?

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7147

Title: Epidemiology, demographic characteristics and prognostic predictors of ulcerative colitis

Reviewer code: 00503612

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2013-11-06 17:06

Date reviewed: 2014-01-25 04:58

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. It is a decent review and (in general) well written. A few comments/questions: 1. What is the need/void that this review fits into? In other words, what has come up recently that the is novel in the review, has really changed recently or merits another review for UC? 2. Your sections on mortality are really over the map. What do patients die from with UC? The UC? Postoperative? Wasting/ Perforation? Concomitant extra-colonic problems (PSC?). 3. Above is just one of many examples of how this review lacks focus for the variables discussed. Obviously the medical and surgical therapy are in and of themselves huge topics. 4. Age--Why is there an increase in incidence across different age cohorts--do we know? Better diagnostics? Better attention/focus on the disease itself? What. 5. Factors predicting prognosis is too broad and vague. These are huge questions and yet you have a paragraph with in some cases one reference. How can this be so?