

15th August 2017

Dear Sir

We thank you and the reviewers for the constructive suggestions to improve our review article "Epidemiological and Clinical perspectives on Irritable Bowel Syndrome in India, Bangladesh, and Malaysia: A Review" submitted to the World J Gastroenterol. We have revised the paper according to the reviewers' suggestions. We believe, that the paper is now substantially improved after revision based on very constructive and thorough suggestions from the reviewers. Please note that all the changes have been marked with red fonts.

We hope that the revised paper will meet the standard of your journal.

Thanks

Sincerely

The authors

Comments (Reviewer 1)	Response
The abstract is too short; it should be more informative.	We revised the abstract to make it more informative
One or two more key words are needed (e.g. perspectives; symptoms; clinical.....)	We have provided three more key words
A recent study was published on Gut (Gut. 2017 Jun 7. pii: gutjnl-2016-312852. doi: 10.1136/gutjnl-2016-312852. Rome Foundation-Asian working team report: Asian functional gastrointestinal disorder symptom clusters. Siah KTH1,2, Gong X3,4, Yang XJ5, Whitehead WE6, Chen M4, Hou X7, Pratap N8, Ghoshal UC9, Syam AF10, Abdullah M10, Choi MG11, Bak YT12, Lu CL13, Gonlachanvit S14, Boon CS15, Fang F16, Cheong PK16, Wu JCY16, Gwee KA2), and I believe that it would be appropriate to discuss the results of that study in the section "SYMPTOM PROFILE AND DIAGNOSIS OF IBS"	We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. We are sorry for this mistake. In fact, this is one of the papers from our group. Since this paper was not yet published while this review was being written, we did not discuss it. We have added one paragraph on this paper in the revised review.
The tables should be numbered using the Arabic numbers (e.g Table 1, Table 2). Also, in the tables, the abbreviation IBS should be explained under the table.	These points have been included in the revised review
The summary section is somehow weak; for instance, the Authors need to suggest clear cut directions for future studies and their utility in clinical practice as well.	We have added a sub-section on future direction

Comments (Reviewer 2)	Response
Minor points - the authors should quote all recent work from the Asian Working Team of the Rome foundation; - the importance of translating disease-specific questionnaires into the local language should be mentioned (there is increasing literature on the topic, specifically related to Asian populations)	We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. All the major studies of Asian Working Team of the Rome foundation have been cited
The authors should specify (wherever relevant) whether or not local languages were used in obtaining data for the three countries of this work; - especially for the general readership	We have added in the Introduction "Another similarity between these three countries is the language used for medical education and scientific publications. Since the medical education in these three countries are in English language and the scientific studies are also published in English, local languages were

	not needed for data extraction from published literature".
It could be useful to have a table stating current diagnostic criteria according to ROME IV, differences with previous diagnostic criteria and specific issues for Asian populations	A table (Table 2) has been added on Rome IV criteria and the differences between Rome III criteria
I noticed some typos	We have corrected the errors in typos

Comments (Reviewer 3)	Response
I would like to suggest the inclusion of a bibliographical reference in relation to the prevalence of IBS in 2 regions in Brazil (rural and urban) in article written by our research group : "Prevalence of irritable bowel syndrome in a Brazilian Amazon community" Article in Neurogastroenterology and Motility 17(6):883 · January 2006 DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2982.2005.00722.x	We have cited this reference in the revised manuscript
I suggest publishing this revision which has relevant content and proper bibliographical revision. However, an extensive correction of the language used is required	The errors in Language have been corrected in the revised review

Comments (Reviewer 4)	Response
The authors should try to include all recent high-quality relative original studies, either in English or local language. And if necessary (for publication), mark the non-English reference article. If non-English studies were not included in this review, it should be mentioned clearly in the head of the article. Most probably readers will have same the doubts as we had.	We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. All the major relevant studies have been cited. All the studies were in English as all the papers from these three countries on this issue have been published in English. We did write in the Introduction "Another similarity between these three countries is the language used for medical education and scientific publications. Since the medical education in these three countries are in English language and the scientific studies are also published in English, local languages were not needed for data extraction from published literature".
There are a lot of comparison between the countries or regions in the manuscript. In order to make the article more smooth and readable, it will be appreciated if comparison in these paragraphs can be re-arranged in a similar sequence.	We have tried to revise the paper to make it more readable
Some language mistakes remained be corrected.	The errors in Language have been corrected in the revised review