September 14, 2013

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 4974-review.docx).

Title: The effectiveness of IGRAs for differentiation of intestinal tuberculosis from Crohn's disease in Asia : A systematic review and meta-analysis

Author: Chen Wen, Fan JunHua, Luo Wei, Peng peng, Su SiBiao

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4974

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
  (1) Title - would remove "in Asia" from title, as you did not plan to look at only papers from Asia.

For this, the title had been revised as "**Effectiveness of IGRAs for differentiating intestinal tuberculosis from Crohn's disease: A meta-analysis**".

  (2) Methods - why were only English language abstracts searched? If this is a common topic in Asia, then excluding non-English papers may leave relevant papers out. You need to state what your inclusion criteria were for the gold standard against which each test was compared. You have included papers that have different standards for a diagnosis of intestinal TB.

  For this, in fact, we did not include those articles which were only English language abstracts according the "Methods" of our meta-analysis. Moreover, excluded non-English papers would reduce the language bias. So we only permitted the review of articles published in the English language for the full text review and final analysis.

  (3)Data Extraction - Placing scalar grids over plots needs a reference to confirm its validity as an approach.

  For this, the approach of data extraction was widely used in the diagnostic meta-analysis, and we displayed the date of studies in Table 1 based on the approach of date extraction.

  (4) Statistics - why was a random-effects model used if there is heterogeneity amongst the studies?

  For this, in fact, mostly Statistical experts suggested to use the random-effects model to analyse the heterogeneity or un- heterogeneity date, not the fixed-effects model.

  (5) Results - need to give a reason why 8 studies were excluded based on their contents (in a separate Table). You should perform sensitivity analysis if only the studies that used histological or microbiological confirmation of ITB are included. Does this change the SROC? Publication Bias - Egger tests are not useful if less than 10 studies are included, as

in this case.

For this, we had revised their contents in the Figure 1. In this meta-analysis, the ITB diagnosis was confirmed by bacteriology, histology or clinical course in all of included articles. We could not extract the respective date of each approach of ITB diagnosis, so we would not acquire respective SROC date. We also realized that Egger tests were not useful if less than 10 studies were included, and we abolish to use the Egger tests for publication bias.

(6)Discussion - is too long, no need to reiterate the background literature on this topic, just your conclusions.

For this, we had revised the contents of "Discussion" based on your suggestions.

3 References and typesetting were corrected

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

Sincerely yours,

Dr Su