

Authors' response to the reviewers

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Dear editors and authors of the manuscript "Obstructive and secretory complications of diverting ileostomy" The topic of the review is relevant, because it is devoted to the complications of surgery, which is in itself a method of preventing complications of surgical treatment of colon diseases. The data is selected by the authors at a good level. The scientific style and grammar are well presented. However, it should be noted that the authors aim to describe two big problems of diverting ileostomy in this manuscript. Both ileostomy obstruction and electrolyte depletion may be separate areas for study. Perhaps it would be more expedient to divide this manuscript, since the perception of the material and attention to the text of the manuscript is dispersed and its scientific value decreases. The review also includes generalized tables, while some points require interpretation and specification, for example, anatomical features of the patient (length of the mesentery of the intestine, thickness of the anterior abdominal wall and rectus muscles, exhaustion of the patient, local features of the ileum), general systemic disorders are indicated as risk factors for complications. The authors do not provide absolute values of these parameters and methods of managing them. The manuscript will be of interest to clinicians, while the revision of the presented material and correction of data are required.

Response:

Thank you very much for your considerable suggestion and important query.

1. As you mentioned, this review article may preferably be divided into "obstructive" and "secretory" complications considering their clinical significance and scientific values. However, after careful discussion among the authors, we will not divide this manuscript for the following reasons. First, because this is an invited manuscript from the BPG editorial office, this contribution was assigned to a single review article entitled "obstructive and secretory complications of diverting ileostomy" at the time of invitation acceptance. Second, we would like to highlight

our proposal within the same manuscript that obstructive and secretory complications may occur simultaneously, and they prompt the need for further monitoring and surveillance for patient safety.

2. We appreciate your valuable comments. As you suggested, interpretation and specification with appropriate values were missing in the originally submitted manuscript. Therefore, we added some absolute values to Tables 1 and 2, whereas some data were not available in the selected article. Furthermore, we have attached citation numbers to each variable. In addition, the “Causes and risk factors” sections have been strengthened with more detailed descriptions of the variables.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Summarizing the article: The study aims to review the two major complication types associated with diverting ileostomy, obstructive complications and secretory complications. It focuses on the etiology, diagnosis, as well as management, and prevention of said complications. Due to the review nature of the study, no original hypothesis or new findings were noted, as appropriate. What is the importance of this manuscript? The manuscript provides an overview with details focused on the topic of interest and presents the available findings in a concise manner. Conclusions summarize the findings accurately. Especially, the manuscript describes in details, the various prevention approaches currently being tested. What are the limitations of the study and its findings? There are some limitations that are inherent to the type of the article, as it is limited to review, and due to lack of clarity regarding which articles were reviewed, literature search criteria, etc., for readers, it becomes unclear how recent the review literature is without looking at the references. Specifying the limitations and clarifying the review selection will provide further value to the manuscript. Again could be based on the nature of the type of manuscript itself if accepting the restrictions.

Response:

We would appreciate your thoughtful and supportive comments.

1. We have added the “METHODS” section clarifying the literature search and selection criteria.
2. We have also added the “LIMITATIONS” section specifying the limitations of this review article.