Point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments:

We wish to thank the reviewers for their valuable comments which helped to increase the quality of our work.

Reviewer #1:

1. I think the titles or subtitles in the article did not match the text below with talking about suspected IBD under the section of known IBD and vice versa. It can be modified to be" enteroscopy in suspected IBD in children, etc. " Enteroscopy in suspect IBD in adults", "Enteroscopy in combined suspected and known IBD population". It would be less confusing if we can mention adults or children in text. Example: page 7, line 18.
Response: thanks to the reviewer for his comment. We changed subtitles as suggested and we agree that it is more clear now.

2. I would change the subtitles in the discussion and conclusion as suggested in the attached reviewed version. The conclusion should start on page 16 line 7. The title conclusion in the manuscript should be Discussion.
Response: done

3. In page 3,line 29, specify please which population of patients has low specificity of the capsule endoscopy given the variability of this parameter between published studies. It has a widespread indication for CE and every indication may have different specificity.
Response: done

4. There was an error in the reference of table on page 14 the last line. It should be table 2 not 3.
Response: corrected

5. Spellings error as follow. • The word ulcerative on page 3 line 4. • The word multicenter page 8 line 3 and all throughout the article. • The word re-dilatation in the discussion section page 12 line 16 and 19. • The word maneuver page 6, line 4. • The word analyzed on page 11, line 8 repeated also in other sections. • The word than in page10, line 6. • Add the noun' it" page15, line 25. Example: it needs…. • The word localization in page16 line 12
Response: corrected according to the suggestions

6. The diagnostic yield percentages in the text do not match the table. Can you elaborate specifically on the diagnostic yield on page 9, second paragraph, line 15 by Tun et al. If any results are calculated by the authors as mentioned in page 16 line 5, it is worth mentioning in the text. It is important to specify the definition of diagnostic yield? Is it any finding or IBD specific diagnosis?

Response: thanks for this comment. There was a mistake based on the analysis of results of the study. We agree that it's not possible to explicit the diagnostic yield of this study, so we erased the result; but authors assert how on 45% of patients, DBE had an impact on patient management. We changed the table 2 accordingly. However, where indicated, diagnostic yield is based on IBD specific diagnosis and not on any finding.

7. I think it will be visually helpful to add these algorithms of enteroscopy use in children with suspected or known IBD in beautifully written review like this that is either suggested by the author or published previously (The algorithm were mentioned on page 10 and page13 in suspected and known IBD).
Response: thanks for this comment. We added 2 figures with the algorithms in the text.

8. There is duplicated reference 29 and 42 which is the same. Re arrange the references after that accordingly.
Response: done.

9. Tables changes: • I would suggest specifying the impact on patient management and specify if there is any change in diagnosis, change in therapy, or intervention is needed in each of the studies because of its relevance clinically. In the table 2, page 26.
Response: we fully agree with the reviewer. We added all the requested results, where available, in the text.
• I suggest adding the reference number at each study under the author, journal, year in table 1, 2 and 3.
Response: done
• In Table 2, Navaneethan 2014 study in table it is mentioned retrospective but it not matching the text. Please verify is it retrospective or prospective?
Response: thanks for this comment. We apologize for the confusion, but this was a retrospective study on a prospective registry. However, this sentence created confusion, so we corrected as follows "Navaneethan et al. retrospectively reviewed a BAE registry".
• Please add the management impact for the suggested studies (Navaneethan 2014 and Christian 2016) because some of these therapeutic changes are mentioned in the original article. I don't think NA(not applicable) is accurate.
Response: thanks for your comment. About the study of Navaneethan et al. we added the value of impact on clinical management for known IBD patients and we explained it better in the text. However, concerning the suspected IBD patients, authors do not explicit the impact of DBE on management, except for one patient as reported in the paper. Concerning the study of Christian et al. we added the requested value in the table.
• I would suggest adding another column stating clinical therapeutic impact either (confirmed Crohn's diagnosis, change in medical therapy, or therapeutic intervention, etc) in management of the patients in pediatric IBD. It is worth summarizing that for the reader in the table if it is available to meet the study objectives to achieve therapeutic decisions and to plan the follow-up.

Response: we fully agree with the reviewer. We added all the requested results in the table.

Editorial Office's comments

(1) I found the authors did not add the PMID and DOI in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout; and (2) the author should number the references in Arabic numerals according to the citation order in the text. The reference numbers will be superscripted in square brackets at the end of the sentence with the citation content or after the cited author's name, with no spaces.

Response: list of authors and all the PMID and DOI have been added for all the references.