

Dear editors and reviewers:

Thank you for the comments to our manuscript.

It's really an honor to receive your suggestion. We have revised the manuscript according to the comments. If you have other suggestions and opinions, you can contact us later.

Reviewer #1:

Comment 1: Please provide data about this precleaning kit regarding infections produced by viruses, prions etc.

Reply 1: Thank you for your comment. We regret that we did not conduct virus or prion test previously because of the high accuracy requirements for virus test and the extremely low incidence of prions. We are considering adding these two tests in future research.

Comment 2: Please mention clearly (in the Abstract and Discussion) the cost-sparing effect of this kit.

Reply 2: Thank you for your suggestion. We have edited the abstract and discussion to clearly describe the cost-sparing effect of the precleaning kit.

--Changes in the text: See the Result section of the Abstract and the fifth paragraph of the Discussion.

Comment 3:

Abstract:

a. It should be made clearer. We do not get much definite info from it.

b. Conclusion: “Considering the economic cost...” . Well, there is nothing about the costs in the Abstract. Please be more generous and write a proper Abstract, that would definitely summarize the full manuscript.

Reply 3: Thank you for your comment. We have edited the abstract to clearly summarize the content of the article.

--Changes in the text: See the Abstract.

Comment 4:

Introduction:

a. 2nd line - please replace “endoscope” with “endoscopy”

b. Authors should write about other types of infections transmitted by undisinfected /not enough disinfected/ contaminated endoscopes - viruses, prions etc.

Reply 4: Thank you for your careful suggestion, we have revised the terminology and added descriptions for other types of infections (viruses and prions).

--Changes in the text: See the first paragraph of the Introduction.

Comment 5:

Discussion: generally, nicely conceived. However, I suggest starting with your own

results and then comment with the scientific literature, instead of just theory at the beginning. You should value your results. Also, please present proper future directions for research.

Reply 5: Thank you for your valuable comment. We have revised the discussion section, focusing on our own results to expand discussion, and then presenting future directions for research.

--Changes in the text: See the Discussion.

Comment 6:

References: The format is not the one by the journal. Please correct.

Reply 6: We have corrected the reference format.

--Changes in the text: See the References.

Comment 7:

Please insert authors' ORCID Number.

Reply 7: We have inserted the ORCID numbers of all authors.

We have tried our best to revise our manuscript according to the comments. We would like to express our great appreciation to you and reviewers for comments on our paper. Looking forward to hearing from you. Thank you and best regards.

Yours sincerely,

Yu Wu

Institute: Department of Gastroenterology, Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha 410008, Hunan, China.

Address: Department of Gastroenterology, Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha 410008, Hunan, China.

Email: wy22xy@163.com