

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 33006

Title: Remission endpoints in ulcerative colitis: A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 02551508

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2017-02-12

Date reviewed: 2017-02-14

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

None

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 33006

Title: Remission endpoints in ulcerative colitis: A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 03260089

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2017-02-12

Date reviewed: 2017-02-16

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

(1) Is the overall structure of the manuscript complete? A complete manuscript will contain title, abstract, key words, introduction, materials, methods, experimental procedure, results, discussion, conclusion, acknowledgements, and references. YES (2) What is the scientific question proposed in the manuscript? This should be clearly presented in the Introduction section, along with the pertinent background, rationale, aim, major findings and potential significance of the study. Collectively, this information should inform whether the manuscript would be interesting enough to warrant readers' attention? This systematic review will reassess and summarise the current consensus on the definition of remission and the endpoints employed in clinical trials by focusing on two most validated and well-used indices, the Ulcerative Colitis Endoscopic Index of Severity (UCEIS) and Ulcerative Colitis Disease Activity Index (UCDAI), in order to address the issues with the standardisation of clinical trial protocols. (3) Which special (unique, innovative and/or timely, appropriate) methods and techniques are adopted in the manuscript? This should be clearly presented in the Methods section. In addition,

does the manuscript provide adequate details of methods (including experimental design, subjects or materials, data collection methods, and statistical methods) to allow a reader to repeat the research? A systematic bibliographic search was performed between 10th and 14th November 2016 of the following online databases: OVID SP MEDLINE (1946 to present), OVID EMBASE (1974 to present), National Library of Medicine's Pubmed Central Medline (1950 to present), the Cochrane Library, using the key heading-words strategy set below and the medial subject heading (MeSH). The bibliographies of recovered systematic review, meta-analysis, and review articles were also searched for additional articles. 12 Each database was searched for the following headings. Ulcerative colitis endoscopic index of severity ("ulcerative colitis") AND ("ulcerative colitis endoscopic index of severity" OR "UCEIS") AND ("remission") Ulcerative Colitis Disease Activity Index ("ulcerative colitis") AND ("Ulcerative colitis disease activity index" OR "UC disease activity index" OR "UCDAI" OR "Sutherland index") AND ("remission") Non-English articles, studies pertaining to paediatric subjects, and non-human subjects were excluded. Studies presenting data of patient populations already included in other publication (duplicates) were excluded. No abstract publications without subsequent full-text published data were used. Disagreements about inclusion were resolved in a consensus meeting. (4) Is the source of the data that is presented reliable? This will be indicated by the information presented in the Results section. The information in the results section will also indicate the academic significance of the main findings (including figure and tables). YES (5) What are the results obtained from the data that is presented in the manuscript? This information will make up the Discussion section. It will also answer the questions of whether the results answered the proposed scientific question, achieved the aim of the study, or confirmed or rejected the hypothesis proposed in the manuscript. This systematic review was conducted to evaluate the definition and evidence for remission endpoints in ulcerative colitis from the point of view of two particular indices. The UCDAI has been widely used in clinical studies compared to the UCEIS. Although the UCEIS has been extensively validated, only one randomised clinical trial has employed the UCEIS as their outcome measurement instrument of date. The reason may be twofold. Firstly, other traditional disease activity measurement instruments have been widely used in previous clinical trials, making comparison with those trials more straightforward, although less robust. Secondary, if

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 33006

Title: Remission endpoints in ulcerative colitis: A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 00503404

Reviewer's country: Hungary

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2017-02-12

Date reviewed: 2017-02-21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a comprehensive review of remission endpoints in ulcerative colitis, the paper is well written and is very useful for both clinical practice and teaching purposes. The only comment is that the paper could be shortened and better focused. In addition, please highlight that UCEIS was recently developed, thus it is no surprise that the number of clinical trials using the score is still low!