Dear Editor-in-chief of World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy,

The authors send a revised version of the manuscript entitled "Review of Small-bowel Cleansing Scales in Capsule Endoscopy: a Panoply of Choices" (ESPS manuscript NO: 26449) to be considered by your Journal.

In order to take into consideration the comments of the editor and reviewers, the authors submit a revised manuscript with all amendments highlighted. Moreover, a point-by-point response is provided to all the comments of the editor and the reviewers:

 # Editor:

As requested by the Editor, a version of the revised manuscript in a word document will be provided to simplify the edition of the article. Furthermore, all authors of the articles included in the references were added, as well as the DOI citation and PubMed citation numbers.

 # Reviewer No 02822816:

"I hope you have read the Guidelines for the submission of review manuscript to WJG, although you have not followed them! Please, include in the structure of your manuscript at least a Discussion Section which should contain a synthesis of the data on grading scales of small-bowel cleansing in CE. Please also discuss the limitations of you review. 1. Abstract is lacking! Please, write it. 2. Core-tip is lacking! Please, write it. 3. Keywords are lacking! Please, write them. 4. References: it must be a common practice for authors to write all the references according to the Format for references (PMID and DOI requirements, the name of the author should be typed in bold-faced letters,etc). 5. There are too many tables (9!) and you can easily combine some or even delete (e.g., Table 3-data are well presented in Quantitative Parameters, page 5, first paragraph). 6. There are few grammar/spelling errors; please make corrections. I regret that I cannot recommend your manuscript to the published until a revision dealing with the above comments is made."

Answer to Reviewer:

In the revised manuscript, a comment regarding the limitations of the review was added and tables were simplified. Although a summary of the grading scales of small-bowel cleanliness in CE was provided in the conclusions of the article, a comment synthesizing these grading scales was added to the discussion section, as suggested by the reviewer.

As requested by the author, the abstract, core tip and keywords were added to the revised manuscript. Moreover, grammar errors were corrected and references were updated according to the style of the Journal.

 # Reviewer No 03474123:

"I read the article with great interest. In this article, the authors aimed to compare the grading scales of VCE in current literature. At the tables, the small bowel cleansing parameters of the studies were clearly documented. However, there is not any comparison between the grading scores. Thus, this article may help the physicians how to analyze the quality of the diagnosis, but did not tell us which scoring scale is better than others. Overall, I think that this article doesn't help us to how to score the preparation, but summarizes the current literature."

Answer to Reviewer:

Taking into account the comment of the reviewer, the authors added to the revised manuscript a comparison between the grading scores, to help determine the best small-bowel grading scales in capsule endoscopy.

 # Reviewer No 03478442:

"This is an interesting manuscript about small-bowel cleansing scales. It does not contain any new information though, and the authors do not include their personal impression about which scale is the best to use and incorporate to clinical practice. An effort to compare the scales should be made by the authors at a discussion section. Please include an abstract section with keywords and do not include the number of table in the table itself. Tables 1 and 2 are too detailed and difficult to interpret."

Answer to Reviewer:

Similar to the request of the previous reviewer, the authors added to the revised manuscript a comparison between the grading scores in the discussion section, to help determine the best small-bowel grading scales in capsule endoscopy. Moreover, the abstract and keywords were added and the tables were simplified.

After consideration of the reviewer comments, the authors send a revised version of the manuscript to be considered by your Journal.

Kind regards,

Ana Ponte