



April 27, 2014

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript : **Title:** TEMPORAL TRENDS IN INFLAMMATORY BOWEL DISEASE PUBLICATIONS OVER A 19 -YEARS PERIOD

**Author:** Yael Weintraub ,Francis B. Mimouni, Shlomi Cohen,

**Name of Journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 10463

We would like to address point by point the criticisms, queries and comments of all 3 reviewers as well as the editorial comments inserted on the "edited manuscript"

A. Editorial comments inserted on the "edited manuscript"

1. There is no need for providing language certificate by professional English Language editing company as one of the authors (Francis B Mimouni is a US citizen native English speaker)
2. The article may be considered as a Research paper from the category of "observational studies".
3. A running title has been added.
4. The authors names, affiliations, and respective contributions are now presented as requested.
5. The methods in the abstract have been lengthened to slightly more than 80 words as requested.
6. The conclusion has been shortened as requested
7. A "core tip" section has been added.
8. All abbreviations and acronyms in the text have been defined in the "abbreviations section" here.
9. All the references in the text are now between brackets and in a superscript font.
10. A new section of "Comments" has been added as requested.
11. All references have been corrected as requested.

B. Reviewer 1:

1. The reviewer finds it interesting that the number of clinical trials, RCT, and metaanalysis especially increased, but wishes to know what kind of papers (i.e., clinical trial for biological therapy, etc.) in each category is increased.

Since there is no limit to the number of categories we would have to study, and since this would require an extensive analysis of each single of the nearly 50,000 articles published, it is would become a nearly impossible task. However, the reviewer makes an excellent point, that we have included now in the discussion section as a possible limitation of the study. (page 9, para 1, line 14)

2. In the section of Results, the reviewer is correct and “1.4” and “3” were corrected as “2” and “1.4”. Sorry for the typo.

C. Reviewer 2:

The reviewer does not agree that the number of guidelines is small. However he/she believes like us that the savant societies should periodically release guidelines on general and specific topics based on changes of the current knowledge. He/she suggests to change this conclusion, but keep the recommendation of closer collaboration between experts and experts societies.

We have, at the reviewer's request withdrawn the reference of “small” numbers and we have kept the recommendation. (page 10, para 2, line 9)

D. Reviewer 3:

The reviewer wishes to have seen a comparison of the IBD literature with other fields of medicine. It's obviously an interesting question, but well beyond the scope of this IBD study. We therefore have elected to only address it in the discussion as a theoretical question. (page 10, para 2, line 4)

1. We could not find a missing bracket on RCT results from adult patients.

2. The reviewer is correct: there were no significant changes in editorials on pediatric, and the p-value of 0.04 has been removed (Sorry again for the typo).

We are very thankful to the Editor and to the reviewers for their excellent comments, which allowed us, we believe to significantly improve the quality of our manuscript.

We are hopeful that the revised version will be now found suitable for publication.

We look forward to hearing from you in the near future,

Respectfully,

Sincerely yours,

**Shlomi Cohen, MD**  
**Department of Pediatric Gastroenterology**  
**Tel Aviv , Israel**