

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11893

Title: Difference of clinical features between Crohn's disease and intestinal tuberculosis

Reviewer's code: 02542022

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2014-06-11 12:19

Date reviewed: 2014-07-07 12:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript, the authors tried to develop a new scoring system for differential diagnosis between CD and ITB. The found multiple features supporting CD or ITB and made a scoring system based on those features. 1. In designing this prospective study, how did the authors calculate sample size? 2. Please provide the references for diagnostic criteria of ITB. 3. Please present the detailed method and positive criteria for PPD test. 4. What is the definition or characteristics of "nodular hyperplasia", which was more commonly observed in CD patients? 5. The endoscopic, pathologic, and radiologic evaluation (CTE) could be subjective. How were they performed? Were they performed by more than two independent blinded researchers? Please describe the detailed methods. 6. What is the "intestinal diseases" in CTE? Did this mean small bowel involvement? 7. The authors did not present and compare the results of chest X-ray. Active or past TB lesions in chest X-ray could be very helpful in differential diagnosis between CD and ITB. It is also very simple and cheap to perform. 8. Did the authors perform ASCA test in this study? It also could be helpful in differential diagnosis between two diseases. 9. How did the authors select 12 variables to make a scoring system among 16 variables in table 2? 10. The results from 65 patients should be validated



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

in the independently enrolled validation set. However, it was not presented. 11. In discussion section, the proposed relationship between diseases and job does not seem to be so persuasive. More evidence or references should be added.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11893

Title: Difference of clinical features between Crohn's disease and intestinal tuberculosis

Reviewer's code: 02445675

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2014-06-11 12:19

Date reviewed: 2014-06-20 17:52

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper addresses an important and low-investigated area aiming to find clinical and diagnostic indicators for differential diagnosis between Crohn's disease and intestinal TBC. Although the author's well describe all the diagnostic tools they used and made a very good statistical analysis I will consider the manuscript suitable for publication on WJG only after a language revision (mainly in the discussion).

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11893

Title: Difference of clinical features between Crohn's disease and intestinal tuberculosis

Reviewer's code: 00035859

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2014-06-11 12:19

Date reviewed: 2014-06-20 23:38

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input 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"/> 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 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting article attempting differentiation between Tuberculosis and Crohn's disease. In the 2nd para of introduction, the sentence starting from Jung Lee et al.--- needs to be rewritten. the test T spot TB is mentioned without any explanation. In patients and methods the following sentence is not clear "Of the 80 patients, 12 patients were lost to follow-up before the diagnosis was confirmed, 0 patient were diagnosed both CD and ITB and 3 patients were diagnosed neither CD nor ITB" For the purpose of development of score to discriminate between intestinal Tb and CD, it is necessary to take absolutely proved cases for each disease. The authors have selected cases in which the differentiation was not possible and trial of anti TB treatment was given. However, in drug resistant TB there may not be response in 2 to 3 month. Authors should mentioned in how many patients with ITB AFB culture was positive and whether drug resistance testing was Performed The details of scoring system are required. How was the weightage for each variable decided? It is not possible that each variable has same weightage. So the basis of the scoring system is questionable. Also the authors have not validated it prospectively. Finally in this article on development of scoring system, the authors have not reviewed the previous attempts at the development of scoring system to



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

differentiate between intestinal tuberculosis and Crohn's disease.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11893

Title: Difference of clinical features between Crohn's disease and intestinal tuberculosis

Reviewer's code: 00042284

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2014-06-11 12:19

Date reviewed: 2014-06-23 08:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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 prospective study was performed to develop scoring system differentiating between CD and ITB. The clinical significance of this type of study seems very high in Asian countries, in which ITB is still prevalent and incidence of CD is continuously increasing. However, I think this paper has many points to be clarified. 1. Please describe the details of study design. Authors said that this study was prospective. However, detailed protocols including inclusion and exclusion criteria were not commented. Also, the details of laboratory and radiologic exams such as TSPOT, PPD, Labs and CTE should be described in Methods. 2. Authors said that CD patients who had not received infliximab & AZA/6-MP/MTX were included. However, I think that study patients also should not be received steroids to be included in this study because steroids may affect the results of AFB culture (An important inclusion criteria of this study). 3. Diagnostic criteria for ITB included improvement of clinical and endoscopic disease activity after at least 3 months of anti-TB therapy. However, the very next sentence said 'anti-tuberculous therapy was tried for 2-3 months'. Which one was correct? 3 months or 2-3 months? Please clarify this. 4. In this study, clinical response to anti-TB medication was defined as loss of subjective symptoms. However, I think this definition was too vague to use in



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

this prospective design. 5. In results section, please add the flowchart of patients' inclusion & exclusion. 6. In the results of CTE section, what do you mean by 'intestinal disease'? It is too vague. 7. Finally authors developed scoring system of CD and ITB. I think it is better if authors show the scoring system as a diagram. 8. In discussion, authors cited study from Lee YJ et al. However, their scoring system did not use 'endoscopic ultrasonography'. Please double-check this. 9. The English in this paper should be revised by a native speaker.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11893

Title: Difference of clinical features between Crohn's disease and intestinal tuberculosis

Reviewer's code: 00735706

Reviewer's country: Malaysia

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2014-06-11 12:19

Date reviewed: 2014-06-29 08:46

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The authors have taken up subject, which has been eluding clinicians for a long time and have tried to compare results of some important parameters. 2. The authors have found some significant results which seem important. 3. It is suggested that the authors make minor changes: a. Title should be modified to include not only clinical picture and other investigations used in the study. b. The tables can be presented better, if comparison is done horizontally between groups and the p value provided at the end of right column. c. The authors could consult another biostatistician, if the data could be further analysed using some modern statistical analysis, which might help identify the role of different factors (if possible)