

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28275

**Title:** The clinical relevance of endoscopic assessment of inflammation in ulcerative colitis: Can endoscopic evaluation predict outcomes?

**Reviewer's code:** 03648053

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2016-06-29 13:23

**Date reviewed:** 2016-07-08 16:30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ Y ] Grade A: Excellent	[ Y ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ Y ] No	[ Y ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[ Y ] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the manuscript entitled "The clinical relevance of endoscopic assessment of inflammation in ulcerative colitis: Can endoscopic evaluation predict outcomes?" the authors describes compiled about a method to predict revival of UC using an endoscope. This is well written and several reports using various modality is reviewed, and it's easy to be gathered and understand. I have no major criticisms, but some points should be revised before its publication. 1) In the "Does endoscopy correlate with clinical symptoms?" section, there are two periods in the 6th line. 2) In the same section, I think the number of cited references is mistaken. The 8th line Osada et al are the 37th, and the 10th line Karoui et al are the 36th. 3) In the "Does advanced imaging modalities predict relapse?" section, I think that "the others" etc. is appropriate in the beginning of the paragraph given about AFI, iScan and FICE.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28275

**Title:** The clinical relevance of endoscopic assessment of inflammation in ulcerative colitis: Can endoscopic evaluation predict outcomes?

**Reviewer's code:** 03646542

**Reviewer's country:** Denmark

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2016-06-29 13:23

**Date reviewed:** 2016-07-10 20:13

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Dr. Subramanian , Thank you for submitting the manuscript entitled "The clinical relevance of endoscopic assessment of inflammation in ulcerative colitis: Can endoscopic evaluation predict outcomes?". This manuscript is a narrative, invited review considering correlation between endoscopical findings and clinical outcomes. I find this manuscript well-written, easy to understand and concise. However, I have following comments to the text: Major comments: I find the "Does advanced imaging modalities predict relapse:" section and "Conclusion" section to be a bit short. How is the study selection performed? Did you consider mentioning other studies about advanced endoscopy, such as: Karstensen JG et al. Confocal laser endomicroscopy in ulcerative colitis: a longitudinal study of endomicroscopic changes and response to medical therapy (with videos). Gastrointest Endosc. 2016 Mar 2. pii: S0016-5107(16)00222-4 Buda A et al. Confocal laser endomicroscopy for prediction of disease relapse in ulcerative colitis: a pilot study. J Crohns Colitis. 2014 Apr;8(4):304-11 Li CQ et al. Use of confocal laser endomicroscopy to predict relapse of ulcerative colitis. BMC Gastroenterol. 2014 Mar 11;14:45. Minor comments: I propose that space be inserted



## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

in table names, eg. Table 1 instead of Table1 Furthermore, same formatting would be desirable throughout the tables in the manuscript (e.g. all references are in bold in Table 2 except for Mayo score(17); studies and references are all in bold in Table 3) In the "Endoscopy in UC:" section, 11th line, after the "Studies suggest that among experienced endoscopists there is a good inter-observer agreement in UC related endoscopic findings." a reference is desirable. In the "Does endoscopy correlate with clinical symptoms?" section, there are to periods in the 6th line. Osada et al (38) in the 8th line is not referring to the correct study In the reference list, the 9th and the 15th reference are written in capital letters. I propose that references with more than three authors be shortened into "...et al." I hope you will take these comments into consideration.