

**Clinical Profile, Diagnostic Yield and Procedural Outcomes of Patients
undergoing Single Balloon Enteroscopy - A Tertiary Care Hospital Experience**

Ref: Manuscript NO 77137

Dear Dr. Wang,

I hope you are well. We are honoured that our work is being considered for publication in your prestigious journal, World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy. We are extremely grateful for the feedback from the peer reviewers which has allowed us to strengthen our manuscript.

We have worked diligently to thoroughly address all reviewer comments and have done our best to respond to their queries in the response form below.

Please find below, in blue, our point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments and concerns. We have highlighted all requested changes within the new upload for the manuscript, and we hope that our research will provide a framework to others in understanding the clinical impact and procedural outcomes of single balloon enteroscopy.

We look forward to hearing your response.

Best regards,

Dr Faisal Wasim Ismail, FCPS, Associate Professor,

Department of Medicine,

Aga Khan University, Stadium Road,

PO Box 3500, Karachi 74800,

Pakistan.

Cell: +92 300 9214175

E-mail: faisal.ismail@aku.edu

Reviewers' Comments to the Authors:

Reviewer #1:

1. The title of the manuscript doesn't clearly status the objective of the study, need some modifications.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We have amended our title accordingly.

2. The problem identified under background ie. scarcity of published research on disease outcome, was not addressed under result or discussion section.

Response: Thank you for this observation which we feel will improve our work. We have addressed the scarcity of published research on disease outcome in the discussion section.

3. What was the operational definition for "outcome" the authors inferring?

Response: The operational definition for “outcome” was defined as a change or otherwise in the patient’s diagnosis and management as a result of the findings of the procedure. We have added this in the materials and methods section as well.

4. Under method, the study design, sampling method, measurements, validity of the tests were not clarified.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We have clarified these points in the materials and methods section in more detail.

5. The discussion was replication of the result which is not necessary.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We have removed the replicated statements outlining the results in the discussion section.

6. Conclusion part has biased some of the findings despite the result found was similar or inferior to the other literature. eg. the procedure associated complication rate which is 4.9%, compared a review by Wadhwa et al. findings which was negligible. Additionally, it doesn't include outcome result.

Response: Thank you for this observation. As a result of your suggestion, we have corrected the statement and specified the outcomes as being “non-severe” in nature. We have included the outcome result as well.

Reviewer #2:

1. The Authors conducted a retrospective study about the clinical yield of SBE. The study, considering the obvious limitations of a retrospective, single centre study (well explained in the Discussion section), is well designed as Authors used the change in diagnosis and management as a quantitative evaluation of clinical yield. The manuscript is fluent and well written.

Response: Thank you so much for your comments and approval.

2. Since most of the procedures described were non-operative, capsule endoscopy as a preliminary exam prior to device-assisted enteroscopy should be discussed in the paper (Introduction section or Discussion as well).

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We have added this point in the introduction section.

3. References about this are a bit outdated. Most updated guideline should be cited (Endoscopy 2018, doi: 10.1055/a-0576-0566), as well as a very recent report of

diagnostic yield and safety of capsule endoscopy in a large cohort (Clin Res Hepatol Gastroenterol 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.clinre.2020.03.011).

Response: Thank you for this observation which we feel will improve our work. As a result of your suggestion, we have referenced the most updated guidelines in both the introduction and discussion sections.

4. Second, double check for some typos (i.e. page 9 SPSS instead of SPPS). I have nothing to add.

Response: Thank you for pointing this out. All authors have reviewed the manuscript in its entirety and all typos have been corrected to the best of our knowledge.