

Reply to reviewers

We would like to take this opportunity to thank the editors and reviewers for their input with this manuscript. The guidance provided has been very helpful.

All comments are addressed below.

Specific Comments to Authors: In general, the review gives an interesting overview about a significant clinical problem. However, some points might be addressed:

1. The manuscript need significant editing of language quality. In fact, the meaning of some sentences is not clear and a number of grammatical mistakes should be corrected.
 - a. **The language has been addressed. We hope the improvements provide clarity.**
2. What is figure 1? There is no figure included but a table.
 - a. **This table was incorrectly labelled and the issue has been rectified.**
3. The authors state that radiation proctopathy can be “observed following therapy for a range of primary sites including prostate, cervix, urinary bladder, testes and uterus.” What about the use in anal or rectal cancer?
 - a. **Rectified to include other sites.**
4. A figure or maybe a table that summarizes the treatment modalities for certain complication in each part of the GI tract might improve the value, clarity and information content of the review.
 - a. **As per recommendation additional table added to provided further clarity.**

LANGUAGE QUALITY

Please resolve all language issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report. Please be sure to have a native-English speaker edit the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, word usage, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, format, and general readability, so that the manuscript’s language will meet our direct publishing needs.

Language issues have been addressed.

EDITORIAL OFFICE’S COMMENTS

Science editor:

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a minireview of the update on the management of the gastrointestinal effects of radiation. The topic is within the scope of the WJGO. (1) Classification: Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: In general, the review gives an interesting

overview about a significant clinical problem. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; (3) Format: There is 1 table; (4) References: A total of 63 references are cited, including 19 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There is no self-cited reference; and (6) References recommendations: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially references published by the peer reviewer(s) him/herself (themselves). If the authors find the peer reviewer(s) request for the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself (themselves), please send the peer reviewer's ID number to editorialoffice@wjgnet.com. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately.

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade C.

3 Academic norms and rules: No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4
Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJGO.

5 Issues raised:

- (1) The language classification is Grade C. Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies we recommend: <https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>;
 - a. As per previous recommendation language issues addressed.
- (2) The "Author Contributions" section is missing. Please provide the author contributions;
 - a. This has been done.
- (3) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout.
 - a. PMID and DOI numbers added to references.