PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics*

Manuscript NO: 74817

Title: Prevalence, phenotype and medication for the Paediatric Inflammatory Bowel Disease population of a State in Southeastern Brazil

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05665395

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: N/A

Professional title: Director, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-07 22:23

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-09 07:48

Review time: 1 Day and 9 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In Brazil, where the inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) prevalence is increasing, the epidemiology of the paediatric population is not well known despite a documented increase in the paediatric IBD incidence worldwide. Espírito Santo (ES) is a state of southeastern Brazil with the highest demographic densities and economic importance in the country. Our epidemiological data including behaviour and medication compared the paediatric and adult age groups. Therefore, this study has the potential to reinforce the need for the adequate care of paediatric patients with IBD and influence public health policies.but The manuscript is not well, concisely and coherently organized and presented. Results and discussion do not cover each other sufficiently.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics*

Manuscript NO: 74817

Title: Prevalence, phenotype and medication for the Paediatric Inflammatory Bowel Disease population of a State in Southeastern Brazil

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00503587

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: New Zealand

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-08 21:04

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-12 17:31

Review time: 3 Days and 20 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [Y] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This MS focuses on a cross-sectional analysis of children (<17 y) in one area of Brazil SPECIFIC COMMENTS 1. It does appear that the assessment of the cases was just at diagnosis. There was no indication of the course of disease over time. Given that the period of time was almost a decade ago, there would be opportunity to elucidate the patterns at and since diagnosis 2. It was not clear why this work focused on people diagnosed 2012/2014? Why did the data not focus also on more recent times? 3. Whilst a pharmacy database might be helpful, it was not clearly displayed that this approach has/had a strong validity. Were pathology or clinical databases cross-checked to confirm that the primary identification of patients was comprehensive? 4. The report focused on just 55 children: relatively small sample size 5. The report focused on the patterns in the children and compared to the adult data indirectly (however adult data not stated or clear at any stage) 6. U-IBD is usually seen as IBDU 7. The term CD patients must be changed to read "patients with CD". Same for other similar terms 8. There are numerous awkward sentences or phrases that need revision and correction. As just one example (of many), this part of the ABSTRACT is unclear: "Although the incidence and prevalence have low rates of ES...." 9. What is meant by the word: propedeutics? 10. Paris classification would typically be used for children 11. Limitations would be expected to be elsewhere in a MS: these are not METHODS as to how the study was conducted 12. RESULTS section needs subheadings throughout 13. The RESULTS says that there were only 31 new cases of IBD in children, with a number of existing cases. It is not clear how these figures shown reach the number of 55 children in the end? Surely some of the 22 patients registered in the second year were those that were diagnosed in the first year?

14. The last part of the RESULTS just refers solely to tables 15. Was there data on ethnicity? Family history? Nutritional status? Diagnostic delay? It would be great to be able to comprehensively describe the group. 16. Disease location relies on full assessment at diagnosis (upper and colonoscopy, and MRE). 17. The DISCUSSION could be greatly enhanced by careful revisions: this would improve readability and flow. Single sentences are not paragraphs.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [Y] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study investigated the epidemiological data related to pediatric inflammatory bowel disease in a local region of Brazil. The results suggest that the prevalence and incidence of pediatric IBD in this region are lower than in Europe and North America but higher than in other countries in South America. Although the authors consider this the first epidemiological investigation on IBD in children in Brazil, it does not suggest some more noteworthy phenomena. Most of the results have already been reported from other similar studies. The study has limited information for the research of IBD in children worldwide. Therefore, the authors are advised to submit to other local journals instead.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics*

Manuscript NO: 74817

Title: Prevalence, phenotype and medication for the Paediatric Inflammatory Bowel Disease population of a State in Southeastern Brazil

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00503587

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: New Zealand

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-07

Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Hong Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-13 21:17

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-13 21:35

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [Y] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

.

Scientific quality	[　] Grade A: Excellent　　[　] Grade B: Very good　　[Y] Grade C: Good [　] Grade D: Fair　　[　] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[　] Grade A: Priority publishing　　[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [　] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing　　[　] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[　] Accept (High priority)　　[Y] Accept (General priority) [　] Minor revision　　[　] Major revision　　[　] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous　　[　] Onymous

| **statements** | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is an interesting manuscript. Authors succeed to present their data in a clear way adding information to the existing literature. Therefore, I have no corrections to do and the manuscript can be published unaltered.