PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 52632

Title: Development of a Prognostic Model for One-Year Surgery Risk on Crohn's Disease Patients: a Retrospective Cohort Study

Reviewer's code: 03658334

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Full Professor

Reviewer's country: Croatia

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-11-24 19:04

Reviewer performed review: 2019-11-26 21:17

Review time: 2 Days and 2 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[Y] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[Y] Advanced
			[ ] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

To the Authors: Thank you for a well-selected and well-crafted topic, very important for everyday practice in treatment of Crohn's disease patients. But, in my opinion, some clarifications and changes are needed.   1. The Methods do not clearly explain the randomization method, e.g. what is meant by a „training set" and what is a „validation set".   2. Furthermore, the objectives clearly state that the risk for surgery is estimated after one year from diagnosis, but in the analysis were included patient with previous resections associated with Crohn's disease and perianal surgery. How do you explain their inclusion?   3.Ultrasound as a method of diagnosis of Crohn's disease is highly dependent on the training and experience of the operator. Was the bowel UTS performed by well-trained operators?   4. Exclusive enteral nutrition (EEN) has proven to be effective in the first manifestation of the disease, especially in small bowel affection. In your work, the effect of EEN in disease complications was examined. It is not stated whether all patients with complications used EEN, or only part of them. The characteristics of patients who have been on EEN should be stated.   5. Relevant literature is cited in the paper, but abbreviations of the journals title are not adequately written.   6. The numbers and explanations of the pictures should be written below, not above the picture.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 52632

Title: Development of a Prognostic Model for One-Year Surgery Risk on Crohn's Disease

Patients: a Retrospective Cohort Study

Reviewer's code: 01555264

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Chief Doctor, Senior Scientist, Technical Editor

Reviewer's country: Iran

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Artificial Intelligence Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-11-23 04:47

Reviewer performed review: 2019-12-06 09:45

Review time: 13 Days and 4 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing		[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good		[ ] Accept (General priority)	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[Y] Minor revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	[ ] Advanced
		[ ] Rejection	[ ] General
			[Y] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

4

Language edition required

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[Y] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[Y] Advanced
			[ ] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper has been well written. Comments and queries are as follows – 1. The rate of intestinal surgery at 1 year appears to be quite high (24.25%) and does not reflect the usual course of Crohn's disease (CD). 2. While including factors in a model, a predictor can be included in multivariate analysis if it is important even if it doesn't have the desired p value on univariate analysis. Age at onset of disease should have been included in the multivariate analysis. 3. What duration of biological therapy or exclusive enteral nutrition was considered as cut-off fir inclusion in this study? 4. Among the 1002 patients included, were data on all parameters available in each of them? 5. How was the site for estimating bowel wall thickness determined, and in what proportion the evaluation was suboptimal? 6. The performance of the model in the validation set showed less than 70% sensitivity and the nomogram appears complex to use. Thus limits the clinical utility of this model.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No