

October 22th, 2018

**Professors Dennis A. Bloomfield and Sandro Vento
Academic Editors, World Journal of Clinical Cases**

Dear Professor Dennis A. Bloomfield and Professor Sandro Vento,

Manuscript ID: 42411

Title: **Radiation exposure during image-guided endoscopic procedures: The next quality indicator for ERCP**

Thank you very much for thoughtful reviews of our manuscript entitled "**Radiation exposure during image-guided endoscopic procedures: The next quality indicator for ERCP**". We appreciate the opportunity to submit our manuscript to the **World Journal of Clinical Cases**. We have revised our manuscript, with the changes highlighted using track changes in Microsoft Word (version 15.26), and answered all questions in a point-by-point manner.

The manuscript has also been revised by an academic editing company (**American Journal Experts; <http://www.aje.com/jp/>**) to correct syntax errors.

We sincerely hope that the revised manuscript is acceptable for publication in **World Journal of Clinical Cases**. We believe that our manuscript is now much improved and that we have resolved several issues that were raised. Our research should be useful to many readers of **World Journal of Clinical Cases**.

Thank you in advance for considering our manuscript for publication.

Sincerely,

Tsutomu Nishida, M.D., Ph.D.

Department of Gastroenterology, Toyonaka Municipal Hospital,
4-14-1 Shibahara, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-8565 Japan

Phone number: +81-6-6843-0101

Fax number: +81-6-6858-3531

Email address: tnishida.gastro@gmail.com

Responses to Reviewer 1's comments

First, we appreciate your constructive comments on our manuscript. We believe that the revised manuscript is significantly improved because of your comments. We asked a copy-editing company (**American Journal Experts; <http://www.aje.com/jp/>**) to correct the syntax errors in the revised manuscript.

Our responses to your comments are presented below.

Reviewer 1's comments

1. *There are several linguistic mistakes and many lines are not properly conveying the message you want to give.... Please discuss in little more detail the various metrics/units used to measure the radiation exposure.*

Our response

Thank you for your constructive comment. As we mentioned above, we asked a copy-editing company to correct the syntax errors in the revised manuscript. As you suggested, we have discussed the various metrics/units used to measure radiation exposure in the text. For clarification, we added the following sentences to the first paragraph of “Measures of radiation exposure for fluoroscopic procedures” on page 14 in the revised manuscript.

‘Dose metrics and units for radiation exposure in medical imaging modalities such as radiography, CT, and fluoroscopy have been systematically defined by international organizations [11] [38] and are used globally in the management of patient radiation doses. Among these metrics, those used in fluoroscopy are more diverse because of the wide variety of clinical applications; in addition, dose metrics and units have not been clearly specified for some fluoroscopic procedures. Consequently, various DRLs and guidelines use varying dose metrics and units, which results in confusion for endoscopists (Table 1).’

2. *Also add a discussion on what is already know in endoscopy literature to minimize the radiation exposure during ERCP (You may briefly discuss some of the studies already published in good endoscopy-related journals on this topic).*

Our response

As you suggested, we have added a discussion of what is already known in the endoscopy literature concerning how to minimize radiation exposure during ERCP based on studies from endoscopic journals. We have revised the first paragraph of “Factors influencing the radiation dose” on page 16 in the revised manuscript.

'For example, high-volume endoscopists can achieve lower radiation exposure [42] [43, 44] [45]. In addition, brief educational programmes for endoscopists or a flashing warning light in the fluoroscopy unit can be effective for reducing radiation exposure [46] [47] because fluoroscopy time is related to radiation exposure [40] [48].'

We believe that the revised manuscript has been significantly improved by your suggestions. We hope that the revised manuscript is acceptable for publication in ***World Journal of Clinical Cases.***

Responses to Reviewer 2's comments

Reviewer 2's comments

To Authors This study develops correctly the various problems linked to disregarded effects of radiation exposure in fluoroscopic procedures in the gastrointestinal field, in particular ERCP. The study shows a complex section in the management of Rx imaging exams, now without guideline. The paper give a complete panorama of a difficult area.

Our response

Thank you for your encouraging comment. We believe that this topic is complex and not well documented but very important. We hope that the revised manuscript is acceptable for publication in *World Journal of Clinical Cases* and that it will improve our awareness and understanding of this issue.

Responses to Reviewer 3's comments

First, we appreciate your constructive comments on our manuscript. We believe that the revised manuscript has been significantly improved because of your comments. We asked a copy-editing company (**American Journal Experts; <http://www.aje.com/jp/>**) to correct the syntax errors in the revised manuscript.

Our responses to your comments are presented below.

Reviewer 3's comments

Please describe the radiation exposure amount and adverse event in more detail.

Our response

Thank you for your comments. As you requested, we have added the following sentences to the “Increasing medical radiation and its adverse events” section on Line 8, Page 11, in the revised manuscript.

‘A total radiation exposure of 1 Sv is estimated to carry a 5% lifetime risk of cancer [12].’

We believe that the revised manuscript has been significantly improved by your suggestions. We hope that the revised manuscript is acceptable for publication in ***World Journal of Clinical Cases***.