

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRGA_95723
Title of the Manuscript:	Predictive factors of endoscopic mucosal healing in patients with IBD on biotherapy
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajrrga.com/index.php/AJRRGA/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Article entitled "Predictive factors of endoscopic mucosal healing in patients with IBD on biotherapy" is an interesting study that brings information regarding endoscopic mucosal healing in inflammatory bowel disease, which has been associated with improved long-term clinical outcome. 2. YES 3. YES 4. NO. The article include only a very small number of patients with ulcerative colitis. Therefore the risk of bias is very high. In the "Results" the authors must emphasize about the clinical and biological differences, that appear in the group that had endoscopic mucosal healing and the other group, who did not had endoscopic mucosal healing. The "Discussion" section is weak. The authors must describe in a more detailed manner their results. The "Conclusion" must be changed, the authors should formulate a more specific conclusion of their study, and not on the data known from the literature. A weakness of this article is the fact that is a retrospective study. 5. YES 6. NO. The authors did not put any reference in the Introduction. This must be corrected. The author must include more recent references in all sections. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	YES	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	English language polishing is needed, there are some spelling mistakes.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cojocariu Camelia
Department, University & Country	Institute of Gastroenterology, University of Medicine and Pharmacy "Gr. T. Popa", Romania