

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 41744

Title: Evaluating mucosal healing using colon capsule endoscopy predicts outcome in patients with ulcerative colitis in clinical remission

Reviewer's code: 00039316

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Ying Dou

Date sent for review: 2018-09-06

Date reviewed: 2018-09-13

Review time: 7 Days

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I reviewed with interest the manuscript entitled "Evaluating mucosal healing using colon capsule endoscopy predicts outcome in patients with ulcerative colitis in clinical remission" in which authors showed that the CCE2 endoscopic score -either MES or

UCEIS- was related to relapse free interval in patients with UC in clinical remission. Moreover, authors evaluated a new lower than recommended volume bowel prep and the acceptance of CCE2 examination in patients with UC in remission. There are two major issues that preclude the publication of the study: 1. What is the primary study endpoint? Authors evaluated different outcomes. If the primary end point of the study was prediction of the relapse free interval in patients with ulcerative colitis in clinical remission, was the sample size calculated accordingly? Thus, the sample is not only small but it's also unjustified. 2. The study is not controlled with conventional colonoscopy; thus authors cannot conclude that "MES, which is most frequently used in clinical trials and practice, was able to predict outcome in the same way as CS" and " In this study, the rate of mucosal healing assessed by CCE-2 seemed to be equivalent to that of colonoscopy" and "These results suggested that CCE-2 could be an alternative to endoscopic examination for follow-up of UC, especially in clinical remission" and "Furthermore, we also revealed that UCEIS, which has been validated to be more sensitive in detecting mucosal inflammation, was able to predict outcome in the same way as CS" Minor comments 1. Results section, effectiveness of colon cleansing. "Although the cleansing level of cecum and ascending colon was lower, the overall rate was within the permissible range." What is the permissible range? 2. Both intro and discussion are lengthy 3. Figure 2 does not add value to the manuscript 4. The statement "Therefore, it has a high level of patient acceptance without anaesthesia" in the introduction section, is not supported by the literature. Actually, there is no evidence either in favor or against this statement 5. Please define CAI score in the abstract

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[] The same title



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

☐ Duplicate publication

☐ Plagiarism

☐ Y No

BPG Search:

☐ The same title

☐ Duplicate publication

☐ Plagiarism

☐ Y No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 41744

Title: Evaluating mucosal healing using colon capsule endoscopy predicts outcome in patients with ulcerative colitis in clinical remission

Reviewer's code: 03478442

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Ying Dou

Date sent for review: 2018-09-06

Date reviewed: 2018-09-18

Review time: 12 Days

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very interesting manuscript about colon capsule endoscopy in UC patients. Indeed, for some of these patients the possibility avoid colonoscopy by means of another endoscopic test is appropriate. The preparation proposed by the authors is interesting



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

but it should be tried in Western populations too. There are some minor issues to be addressed by the authors: The number of cases is rather small. So this is a preliminary study. This should be stated by the authors. How could the authors score separately each part of the colon? That definition would be I guess rather empiric and arbitrary. I would like the authors to comment on that please, explaining how we can distinguish parts and the position of the capsule in the colon. There is no direct comparison with colonoscopic findings. That would add value to the study. I would like the authors to comment on that.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 41744

Title: Evaluating mucosal healing using colon capsule endoscopy predicts outcome in patients with ulcerative colitis in clinical remission

Reviewer's code: 00039143

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ying Dou

Date sent for review: 2018-09-06

Date reviewed: 2018-09-27

Review time: 21 Days

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is of interest for gastroenterologists and endoscopists. The results are very relevant and could have a role in the follow-up of UC patients with clinical remission. In my opinion these data need to be confirmed using colonoscopy as the



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

gold-standard procedure.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No