

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS



February 23, 2014

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 8618-review.doc).

Title: Biofeedback Guided Pelvic Floor Exercises Therapy of Obstructive Defecation: An Effective Alternative

Author: Ma-Mu-Ti-Jiang A ba-bai-ke-re, Wen Ni-re, Hu Yun Long, Zhao Liang, Tuerhongjiang Tuxun, Alimujiang Abulimiti, Yalikus Sailai, Aierhati Husaiyin, Wang Yun-Hai, Yang Peng

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8618

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

- 1 Format has been updated.
- 2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer.
- 3 References and typesetting were corrected.

First of all, thank you very much for your excellent assessments and professional guidance of our research article. Secondly, we will accept all of your advice for biofeedback training to obstructive defecation study. According to your comments, we did the language evaluation and enhancing procedure by the native English professionals in our university. We revised the manuscript according to your comments. We consider some changes are needed accordingly.

Answering to reviewer 00030113:

2. Considering our description "the strongly correlated with improvement in the ability to relax the pelvic floor during defecation and improvement in the ability to defecate a water-filled balloon" is possible correlation which belongs to our hypnosis. After discussion of research members, we consider these sentences are not proper, so we deleted this part.
3. According to deep discussion of study members, the primary purpose of this research should be the life quality score assessing, not be self-satisfaction assessing. So we adjusted this part, replaced the word "satisfaction" to "life quality score".
4. Fulfillment of the Rome III criteria and standard anorectal testing including anorectal manometry (resting pressure, maximum squeeze pressure), ballon expulsion test, electromyography, anoscope, anorectal digital examination were evaluated and justified the diagnoses according to recommended guidelines in face-to-face interviews by the caring physician. We already did the necessary test and added these test to the manuscript.
5. Sample size was calculated before the study. This part was already added to the revised manuscript. Before the research, sample size was calculated by using SPSS software 15.0 version. The total number of patients needed to show a difference in success rate of 30% from the previously established success rate of about 50% was regarded as a clinically significant difference. At least 44 patients in each group was judged to be necessary to show such a difference ($p < 0.05$) in a power of 90%.

6. We tried to combine the tables with each other, however, confusing data make the combined table more complicated. If really necessary, we will replace it.
7. When we finished the research, we connected the dropout patients according to their exact address before we give the revision. So we have already adjusted this part in the revised manuscript. The right description should be: "All patients were then contacted by telephone within 6 month by investigator and asked whether they had experienced adequate relief of constipation".
8. The disorder obstructive defecation is due, in large part, to inappropriate muscular contraction or relaxation during straining and stool evacuation maneuvers. Obstructive defecation, the term currently used to describe this disorder, defines the problem better than the term anorectal obstruction because many of these patients are lack of other aspects of pelvic floor complaints. According to this definition, patients may experience anal sphincter contraction during rectal pressure increase or insufficient relaxation. In addition to somatic complaints, psychological problems and stressors may aggravate patient problems.

Answering to reviewer 02744057

First of all, thank you very much for your excellent assessments and professional guidance of our research article. Secondly, we will accept all of your advice for biofeedback training to obstructive defecation study. According to your comments, we did the language evaluation and enhancing procedure by the native English professionals in our university. We revised the manuscript according to your comments. We revised manuscript and changed the key words according to your guidelines. According to deep discussion of study members, our endpoint purpose of this research should be the life quality score assessing, and not be assessing self satisfaction. So we adjusted this part, replaced the word "satisfaction" to "life quality score".

Answering to reviewer 01558248

Thank you very much for your professional assessment and excellent guidance of our research article. We accepted all of your comments and revised the paper according to your suggestions. Because it will become more complicated to maintain about the placebo treatment in the group of PEG group, so we deleted related part which is less correlated with endpoint purpose of our study. Although we detect the electromyographic findings and manometric tests including rectal resting pressure, maximum squeeze pressure and other related parameters, and some of them demonstrated significant results. However, most of the research members considered that these findings are not strongly correlated with the endpoint purpose (Life Quality Score), so the data of these parts were not concerned in the paper.

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Sincerely yours,

Ma-Mu-Ti-Jiang A ba-bai-ke-re, Surgical assistant Professor, M.D., Ph.D. General Surgical Department of First Affiliated Hospital of Xinjiang Medical University, Urumqi, Xinjiang, China, 830011, 0991-4366142, Urumqi, Xinjiang, China. mamutjan206@sina.com. Post code: 830011 Address: Liyushan Road, No 1, Urumqi, Xinjiang.