

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics

ESPS manuscript NO: 30029

Title: Clinical and economic impact of infliximab one-hour infusion protocol in patients with inflammatory bowel diseases: A multicenter study

Reviewer's code: 02998194

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-09-05 14:12

Date reviewed: 2016-09-18 17:07

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 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 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

This a good effort to show the efficiency of the accelerated (1h) rate protocol. It is necessary to amend few things. The title (clinical..)doesn't correlate with the text. There is no evidence of clinical impact. There is no direct comparison of safety between the two protocols. The standard (2h)rate protocol named total or traditional elsewhere which is not appropriate Table 2 needs corrections (familiarity can't stand for family history and the same happens with mesi) Tables 3 and 4 are similar and without important information

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics

ESPS manuscript NO: 30029

Title: Clinical and economic impact of infliximab one-hour infusion protocol in patients with inflammatory bowel diseases: A multicenter study

Reviewer's code: 03648141

Reviewer's country: Uganda

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-09-05 14:12

Date reviewed: 2016-09-14 08:42

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 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 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

Good study well written. In the methods section, did you mean the data was collected retrospectively but the consent was obtained prospectively? this beat was not clear, otherwise. well done

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics

ESPS manuscript NO: 30029

Title: Clinical and economic impact of infliximab one-hour infusion protocol in patients with inflammatory bowel diseases: A multicenter study

Reviewer's code: 03509648

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-09-05 14:12

Date reviewed: 2016-09-23 10:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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"/> 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 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

Please clarify whether 8 centers were included (as mentioned in abstract), or only one center (as mentioned in discussion) Only minor grammar changes otherwise