

RESPONSES TO REVIEWERS' COMMENTS

Reviewed by 02723208

The topic investigated in this article is really interesting. Nevertheless studies included in this “systematic review” are very different in design and endpoints. The quality of available data is poor and it is very difficult (or impossible) to analyze them in a rigid framework, such as a metanalysis, or even a systematic review. I agree about the fact that the authors used a systematic protocol to identify articles pertinent to their topic. Nevertheless the question(s) investigated in a systematic review should be clearly focused and the review should include a meaningful evaluation of the quality of the available evidence. I think that the Authors should include in the Methods section a more precise description of the question(s) they are investigating and the type of the data they are appraising from original articles. Furthermore I agree with the Authors that in the case of their review, a large part of the methodological recommendations included in a document such as the PRISMA checklist could not be fulfilled; nevertheless the Authors should disclose the reasons in the discussion section. Thus I suggest to the Authors to resubmit the article after revision.

Authors' response: We agree with this reviewer regarding the poor quality and paucity of the available data. However, we believe that concerns exist among gastroenterologists who perform procedures on this patient population and felt it was important to investigate the issues based on the available studies, though they are limited. The methods section has been updated as recommended (changes are highlighted in yellow).

Reviewed by 00056678

The manuscript “A systematic review of endoscopy in neutropenic and/or thrombocytopenic patients” reports the different adverse events in patients with thrombocytopeny and neutropeny after endoscopic treatment. The adverse events are mainly hemorrhage and septic complications. The authors have to expose the results of the studies with percentage of adverse events. In page 10, “In study by Buderus et al.” ought to be changed to “In Burderus's study”. They also ought to explain the abbreviations in the text (ITP/TTP, ANC...). ? Not infrequently has to be corrected. They also need to add the DOI in the references. The manuscript is clear but the article would be even clearer if the data of table 3 and table 4 were included in the same table.

Authors' response: 1) The adverse events percentage was added to the one not done previously; 2) Re "In Burderus's study", the change was made; 3) Abbreviations have been explained; 4) "Not infrequently" was edited (Gastroenterologists may be consulted ...); 5) Tables 3 and 4 were combined into new Table 3.

All changes are highlighted in blue.

MANUSCRIPT REVISIONS

Comment #1: The title has been revised as requested.

Comment #2: We have added the conflict of interest statement and data sharing statement.

Comment #3: We have updated the core tip as requested.

Comment #4: We have attached the audio core tip file.

Comment #5: We have updated the reference numbers with square brackets in superscript throughout the revised manuscript.

Comment #6: We have updated the comments section as advised.

Comment #7: We have added PubMed and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and have listed all authors.

Comment #8: We have submitted our figures in two versions.

Please note that some other minor changes have been made throughout the revised document.