

**Submission of a revised manuscript entitled: Systematic Review And Meta-Analysis Of  
Colon Cleansing Preparations In Patients With Inflammatory Bowel Disease**

Authors: S. Restellini\*, O. Kherad\*, M. Martel, C. Menard, M.T. Taheri Tajan, T. Bessissow,  
P.L. Lakatos, A.N. Barkun

\*equally contributed

Dear Editor,

Please find attached a revised version of our manuscript with corrections highlighted.

Furthermore, you will find below a point-by- point reply to all the reviewer's comments:

We hope you will find the revised version of this manuscript suitable for publication in *World  
journal of Gastroenterology*.

Yours sincerely,

Alan N. Barkun

## REVIEWERS' COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR:

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author:

The systematic review and meta-analysis was to investigate possible differences in terms of effectiveness, safety and tolerability between existing colon-cleansing products in this population. It has significance for clinical practice. The conclusion in the article was incomplete.

*We thank the reviewer for his comment on the significance of our results for clinical practice.*

*The conclusion of the manuscript has been slightly modified as requested with an additional sentence on safety issue.*

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Author:

This is an interesting article that the authors made a study to review and meta-analyze colon cleansing preparations in patients with inflammatory bowel disease IBD. They concluded that in patients without contraindications, low-volume PEG preparation with adjuvants in split-dosing may represent a valid alternative to standard high-volume PEG with at least a similar efficacy and a better acceptability. I agree the methods, results and discussion. However, I have one comment on line 8th of discussion "Severe side effects such as flare of the disease or preparation-induced ulcerations were very rare (<6%)..." I don't agree the term "very rare" here. A study (Qualitative Descriptors of Disease Incidence: Commonly Used and Frequently Muddled) reported by Snowman et al in 2009

to evaluate the use of the terms “frequent,” “common,” “uncommon,” and “rare” in the medical literature and compare their use both within and between two fields of medicine. Although there is different definition qualitatively to discuss disease incidence in the 4 main medical journals, the recent definition of frequency in medicine seems to be that as below: 1.Very common • > 10% 2.Common (frequent) •1~10% 3.Uncommon (infrequent) • 0.1~1% 4.Rare • 0.01~0.1% 5.Very rare • <0.01% Please make a correction.

*We thank the reviewer for this interesting comment. We have changed the sentence accordingly.*

**Reviewer: 3**

Comments to the Author:

**Dear Authors, The manuscript “A systematic review and meta-analysis of colon cleansing preparations in patients with inflammatory bowel disease” is clearly written and well organized. The title reflects the study design and contents of the text, the objective of the study is clearly defined and the study design is appropriate to achieve the objective. The procedures and methods are appropriately described and, despite the limited published data, the study conclusions are justified by the data and analysis. Based on these considerations, I think that the manuscript is eligible for publication.**

*We thank the reviewer 3 for considering the manuscript eligible for publication without any modification.*