Response to reviewers’ comments

We wish to express our appreciation to the Reviewers for their insightful comments, which have helped us significantly to improve our manuscript. According to the suggestions, we have thoroughly revised our manuscript and its final version is enclosed. Point-by-point responses to the comments are listed below.

Reviewer A:

1. Please kindly include reference for usefulness and safety of double-balloon assisted enteroscopy in the discussion of the article.

Response: We agree with the relevance of this reference, and have added it to the Discussion (p. 9, line 13) and References.

2. Please kindly consider data in literature on use of imaging techniques to

diagnose acute radiation entertitis, particularly, use of magnetic resonance

enterography (MRE) or CT enterography. This could be useful for“discussion” in the article.

Reference: Harb AH, Abou Fadel C, Sharara AI. Radiation enteritis. Curr

Gastroenterol Rep. 2014;16(5):383.

Response: We agree with the relevance of this reference, and have added it to the Discussion (p. 9, line 17) and References.

3. There is also literature available about use of biomarkers such as

calprotectin or lactoferrin. Please consider these in “discussion” part

of the article. Reference:

Reference: Harb AH, Abou Fadel C, Sharara AI. Radiation enteritis. Curr

Gastroenterol Rep. 2014;16(5):383.

Response: We agree with the relevance of this reference, and have added it to the Discussion (p. 9, line 17) and References.

4. The characteristics of all 3 patients were similar to each other which is very good. The literature on use of CE to diagnose RE is very limited so this study is very important. The study was able to meet its objectives. However, the clinical effectiveness might be limited since CE is not very widely available and is expensive which is acknowledged by the authors in the article.

Response: We strongly appreciate the reviewer's comment on this point.

------------------------------------------------------

Editor's comments:

1. Please follow the Journal's guidelines for case reports: "Case reports should not exceed 1000 words and should not include more than ten references. Case reports should include a short introduction, the case (s) presentation and a brief discussion, the latter highlighting key lessons from the case(s).

Response: In accordance with the editor's request, we have shortened the manuscript by 1640 words to a revised total of 994 words. This has been achieved by changing the style of expression and deleting unneccesary text.

2. Please avoid the term prospective study since this actually is a case series.

Response: In accordance with the reviewer's comment, we have changed this to case series.

3.Figures 2,3 & 4 could be presented in one figure with selected the best photos and a common legend.

Response: As requested, we have removed Figures 3 and 4 from the revised draft and have combined Figure 2, 3 and 4.