

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Acquired double pylorus: Clinical and endoscopic characteristics and four-year follow-up observations". (ESPS Manuscript NO: 22265).

Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Revised portion are marked in red in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewers comments are as flowing:

Reviewer 1: In this paper the authors describe a four cases of double pylorus. This is a rare condition and manuscript is well written. I kindly recommended it to be published.

Reviewer2: This is an interesting report of four cases with the unusual finding of Acquired Double Pylorus and as such would be worth publishing as an addition to the present number of reported cases. Comments:- It appears that only two patients presenting with gastrointestinal bleeding were treated with pantoprazole and that the only active treatment otherwise was with antacids and the eradication of Helicobacter pylori infection and the omission of NSAID drugs. Is there any reason why all the patients were not given pantoprazole? This needs clarification. It is a pity that follow-up endoscopy was possible on only one patient, and that the follow-up had to be based on clinical symptoms. This has to be accepted. Before being considered as suitable for publication it does require several minor changes as listed below:- **a)** Page 3, "Core Tip". Line 4 . Should read: 0.001-0.4% " of upper gastrointestinal endoscopies" **b)** Page 4 top line reads better as two sentences. "penetrating ulcer. This condition is...." **c)** Page 5, "Endoscopic characteristics", The sentence "the observed channel contractions suggested....to the true pyloric rings" needs rewording as the meaning is not clear. **d)** Page 5-6. The overlapping sentence should read: "In two of the patients a gastric ulcer was seen, in one case on the lesser curve of the antrum, and in the other case on the anterior wall adjacent to the accessory pylorus". **e)** Page 6. 4th line. should read: "duodenum", not "duodenums". **f)** Page6. "intravenous pantoprazole (40-mg)" --- for how long? **g)** Page 8. Discussion. Line 5 "histologies" should read "histology", and Line10. What is meant by a postpyloric ulcer? Shouldn't this be a duodenal ulcer? **h)** Page 10. 2nd para: "fistulous rings" has no meaning. Change to" fistulae". **i)** Page 11. 6 lines from the end: "resulted from nonadherence". What does nonadherence mean? Please clarify. Discussion The Discussion on pages 10 and 11 needs to be divided up into paragraphs with "First, Second, Third, Fourth" as separate headings to make easier reading. Then following these (on page 11) the sentence beginning "Among our four patients....." should begin as a new paragraph. Figures These are good but may be difficult to reproduce clearly when printed. Seven is a large number and the information is available in the text. I suggest selecting just the clearest (Fig 2) as showing a double pylorus and omitting the others.

Answering reviewers 2

Question a:

Considering the Reviewer's suggestion, we have revised.

Question b:

Considering the Reviewer's suggestion, we have revised.

Question c:

Considering the Reviewer's suggestion, we have revised.

Question d:

Considering the Reviewer's suggestion, we have revised.

Question e:

Considering the Reviewer's suggestion, we have revised.

Question f:

The two patients with gastrointestinal hemorrhages were with intravenous pantoprazole (40 mg) twice daily until they left hospital, on days 10 and 7 respectively. Then they were treated with 10 days of triplex HP eradication therapy and proton pump inhibitor (PPI) maintenance therapy.

Question g:

Considering the Reviewer's suggestion, we have changed "histologies" to "histology", and a postpyloric ulcer means a duodenal ulcer actually and we have changed it.

Question h:

Considering the Reviewer's suggestion, we have changed "fistulous rings" to "fistulae"

Question i:

Special thanks to you for your good comments. Nonadherence means noncompliance, disobedience, the failure to obey or poor compliance, we have changed to the failure to follow medication instruction.

The discussion on pages 10 and 11 needs to be divided up into paragraphs with "First, Second, Third, Fourth" as separate headings to make easier reading, because the whole paragraphs is discussing several etiologies of acquired double pylorus, we think put them in whole paragraphs is more better, but if reviewers insisted in dividing up into several paragraphs, we have no problem, because we think it isn't principal question.

About the sentence beginning "Among our four patients....." should begin as a new paragraph, We have revised it.

Last, about how many figures can be selected to printed, we agree the reviewer's suggestion, seven is a larger number, but we think at least keeping figure 2, figure 5 and figure6 in order to describe the endoscopic characteristics and evolution of the acquired double pylorus, but if the reviewer insisted, we have no problem.

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

Lei jing-jing

E-mail: 1330858@163.com

2015-11-16