

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 91837

Title: Are We Ready to Use New Endoscopic Scores for Ulcerative Colitis?

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04091850

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: DSc, MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Denmark

Author's Country/Territory: Chile

Manuscript submission date: 2024-01-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-01-07 12:15

Reviewer performed review: 2024-01-13 10:28

Review time: 5 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The letter comments on studies examining the value of the newly developed Toronto IBD global endoscopic reporting (TIGER) score as an alternative to the traditional Mayo and UCEIS scores. The letter is highly relevant as it points out that more research is still do be done in exploring the correlation between the TIGER score and calprotectin, findings by ultrasound, interobserver agreements in scoring and definitions of remission and response. I have only two minor comments: It is stated that sigmoidoscopy and colonoscopy both can evaluate the extent and severiry of colonic inflammation. This is not always the case using sigmoidoscopy. Additionally in the choice between sigmoidoscopy and colonoscopy it should be noted that sigmoidoscopy might be preferred by some patients.