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Reviewer’s report:

The aim of the article is interesting and the study was well prepared.

However, some aspects must be amended:

(1) English language must be improved

(2) Background
- the aim was to assess eMayo or PanMayo score? Must be clarified.
- there should be a brief description of riley score in the introduction, as you are using it in the next section without any introduction.
- there should be a reference regarding the association of disease extent and the severity of UC.

(3) Patients and Methods
- "Inflammatory Constant" definition shall be better clarified. Why should you include it, if eMayo score already characterizes the disease severity? It is not well justified...
- time of follow-up shall be included.

(4) Results
- In 3.1. - what is the difference between proctosigmoiditis and left-side colitis?

(5) Discussion
- a reference regarding the sentence "endoscopic score indicate the severity of inflammation, .... for the optimisation of the therapy" must be added.
- line 37, "it should be noted that disease location..." and extension too.
- most importantly, a real advantage of panmayo score versus the current scores (mayo score and uceis) must be better developed. From what it is exposed, it is not perceptible. As a matter of fact, UCEIS and Mayo score already assess disease activity with less parameters than panMayo score... This is a major point to be addressed by the authors before considering this paper for publication.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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