

Response to reviews

We had three reviewers: 2 were positive and were concerned with the fact that the paper was difficult to read and redundant in places. We have gone thru it and edited it carefully to resolve that problem. We did not mark the redundant areas removed or the work changes to enhance reading but did highlight in red where larger changes were made.

This is the first recent paper that makes the important point that enteric coated enzyme therapy as essentially no dose-response such that after the initial response further reductions in fecal fat are not reliably obtained and are usually minimal. This explains the findings of most studies such as when a new product high dose product achieves the same effect as many capsules of the same product that contains the same total dose or even a much lower dose. This important observation is critical for understanding the problems with current therapy and provides insights in how to solve it. We agree that we have a lot of figures but each covers an important point and provides the proof that what we say is true. Much of what we say has not been said before or when it was said it was usually as an aside in the discussion. We believe that extraordinary claims requires extraordinary proof.

We have reviewed each figure and "touched the up" to be as uniform as possible and still convey our messages,

We do not agree that a meta-analysis would be useful, first because all recent studies were testing against placebo and we have known the therapy works for 100 or more years. There are no head to head comparisons and even if their were, none has been shown to reliably correct steatorrhea. We did not attempt to cite all prior papers or to cover issues other than pancreatic malabsorption. We have

added a short paragraph to that effect that we did not cover abdominal pain in chronic pancreatitis (the bulk of the evidence is no effect) or irritable bowel syndrome (the evidence is interesting). We do however provide a few references.