

ANSWERING REVIEWERS



Dear Editor,

Title: Intravenous iron supplementation may be superior to observation in acute isovolemic anemia

Author: Hong Man Yoon, Young-Woo Kim, Byung Ho Nam, Daniel Reim, Bang Wool Eom, Ji Yeon Park, Keun Won Ryu

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4967

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

1 Format has been updated

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer

This retrospective analysis was conducted to determine whether the postoperative use of IV-iron for acute severe isovolemic post-gastrectomy anemia in patients not requiring urgent transfusion may be effective. This study enrolled 63 patients with IV-iron sucrose treatment and 60 patients without treatment. Then the authors observed the Hb levels for a period of time. As a consequence, Hb-level in the iron-group increased more rapidly than in the observation group. In conclusion, IV-iron supplementation might be an effective treatment for postoperative isovolemic post-gastrectomy anemia and appears to be a better alternative than clinical observation. However, we have some questions should be resolved.

Major concerns:

1. The numbers of patients and controls are too limited to get a very objective and accurate result.

The reviewer's comment was right. However, we could not collect more cases because this study was pilot and retrospective study. We already have used the intravenous iron for acute isovolemic anemia since 2010.

2. As we all know, the level of Hb is different between male and female. So you should consider this factor and divide the patients according to the gender.

As the reviewer commented, the normal range of the level of Hb is different between male and female. However, we only investigated the change of Hb level between observation group and IV iron group, so we did not consider this factor.

3. At the results part, the author indicated that "The iron-group had more non-surgical complications than the observation group (30.2% and 11.7%, respectively; $p=0.012$)". However, we could not see the corresponding data in Table 5.

As the reviewer commented, we found the mistake. Therefore, we omitted that sentence.

4. At the discussion part, the author was aware of the limitation of this study. We also agree the points you mentioned. Therefore, you should improve your study as well as possible.

The reviewer's comment is right. However, we could not collect the data because this study was retrospective study.

Minor concerns:

The manuscript should be carefully edited and corrected for a large number of grammatical and typological errors.

My opinion: rejection

3 References and typesetting were corrected

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.