

ANSWERING REVIEWERS

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in word format (file name: 21067-Review.doc).

Title: Chronic haemorrhagic radiation proctitis: A review

Author: Vishnu Prasad Nelamangala Ramakrishnaiah, Srinivasan Krishnamachari

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 21067

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

Reviewer 02458220

1. Definition of acute and chronic radiation proctitis are given with proper corrections.
2. Since Histopathology pictures of chronic radiation proctitis are rare, nowadays, since biopsy is not regularly done now, these pictures are included.
3. What we meant by "Improvement" is - in the available literature compared with the previous systemic reviews.
4. This paper is about chronic haemorrhagic radiation proctitis and not on asymptomatic chronic radiation proctitis but still this has been added.
5. In the study reference no 14, Symptoms improved with treatment but no improvement in histology or endoscopic findings that are similar to other studies during that period.
6. Regarding the reference no 8 and 9, these papers were actually cited by Denton in his systemic review and since such studies were very few and also since we could get the translated version online, they were included.
7. Our aim was to review the literature as a whole, and we have not put criteria of 2002 as the watershed year to discuss as the reviewer wishes. Hence the same is not done.
8. When the study was done from 1999 to 2001, rectal biopsies were done for the purpose of the study that was the practice at that time. There were no complications encountered in that study. The same practice has been given up universally.
9. We agree that there is no validated score for radiation proctitis. The weak points about scoring have been discussed in the discussion.
10. There are no new papers in the recent times concerning surgical intervention for Chronic haemorrhagic radiation proctitis (CHRP).
11. Other corrections can be found in the revised manuscript highlighted in red font

Reviewer 02438413

1. We have tried further developing some more analyzers as suggested by the reviewer which can be found in the revised manuscript shown in red font.

2. Success or failure in many of these randomized trials is assessed by the improvement of symptom score or endoscopic score. Different studies have used different methods that have been shown in each of these studies and also have been discussed in the discussion.
3. Study ref.no.1. No signs of toxicity except for the mild pain in the perianal region in a few patients.
4. Alfadhil study was a retrospective study with no objective evaluation that has been highlighted.
5. Study on Vitamin C and E has been further developed
6. Since studies on Mesenchymal stem cells at All India Institute of Medical Science, New Delhi, India, shows not much benefit, we have not included studies on mesenchymal stem cells since it is still experimental.
7. Grammatical corrections have been done.

Reviewer 02953710

1. This review is about the current evidence available in the literature; hence we have not included anecdotal reports and experimental studies.