

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS



February __, 2014

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the revised manuscript (ESPS Manuscript NO: 7572) in Word format (file name: 7572_revised.doc).

Title: Is there a role for colon capsule endoscopy beyond colorectal cancer screening? A literature review

Authors: Konstantinos Triantafyllou, Iosif Beintaris, George D Dimitriadis

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7572

The format of the manuscript has been improved according to the Journal's requirements:

1 Format has been updated to include Book Antiqua 12 font with 1.5 line spacing.

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewers. More precisely:

Reviewer 1. Comments to the Authors. Triantafyllou and colleagues thoroughly conducted a review on videocapsule endoscopy. Particularly they focused their attention on coloncapsule. On this issue, they brought to the readers very updated information and a critical overview. Although, CCE is not a real novelty and many data have been already presented, the authors specifically analyzed two areas where full agreement on CCE usefulness is still debated. Minor revision: Mentioning the author's unpublished data, among other full published studies (moreover, in top level endoscopy journals), is not unnecessary for the manuscript comprehension and do not add further information or value to the data showed. (indication section; page 5, line 5). We recommend the author to remove this information from the text

Response: Thank you for your comment. The relevant information in the text (page 5) has been removed as per your recommendation.

Reviewer 2. This an interesting review, although the current available data on this subject is still very limited, precluding a solid evidence-based conclusion or recommendation at this moment. The authors review the role of capsule endoscopy in colorectal cancer screening. In this context, it will be important to inform the reader about the cost of the procedure as compared with other modalities of screening. Another relevant issue to be discussed is the reading time needed for completion of the procedure, which can make it less attractive. It would be important to discuss the potential implications of this matter in the clinical practice. Although most cases of capsule retention and intestinal obstruction reported in the literature were related to the small bowel, it would be important to mention these potential complications

Response: Thank you for your comments. Based on them, the cost of the various screening modalities in the USA and European countries has been discussed in "Conclusion" (page 14). Also, additions regarding the reading time of the capsule have been made in "Introduction" (page 4) and "Conclusion" (page 14) sections of the manuscript. Finally, a comment regarding possible capsule retention has been added in the "Introduction" section

of the text (page 4).

Reviewer 3. A solid and interesting review that highlights the clinical utility of colonic capsule for 2 important indications I suggest further emphasizing the inability to perform CRC/dysplasia surveillance with colonic capsule for UC , as well as significant discrepancy in the evaluation of disease extent and severity.

Response: Thank you for your suggestions. The inability to perform CRC/dysplasia surveillance with colonic capsule for UC, as well as the significant discrepancy in the evaluation of disease extent and severity have been highlighted in pages 14 and 15 of „Conclusion” section in the text.

Reviewer 4. This review shows relatively good survey of the published articles on the topic of colon capsule endoscopy beyond CRC screening. However, in the abstract portion, I recommend to insert the summary of final paragraph of conclusion (Since capsule endoscopy cannot perform --- inconsistent results.). On page 6, what's reference in 'CTC may miss lesion --- 10% of patients'? On page 10, would you like to summary the contents of data of 2013 United European Gastroenterology Week in Berlin, Germany in page 10 in brief?

Response: The summary of the final paragraph of „Conclusion” has been added to the abstract of the manuscript. The relevant reference regarding CTC miss rate has been added in page 6. In pages 9 and 10, data from the recent UEGW have already been summarized.

Reviewer 5. **GENERAL COMMENTS**

1.The paper is a theoretical review of the studies available in the literature, concerning the indications of the colon capsule endoscopy for the colorectal cancer screening and ulcerative colitis, the advantages and the limits of this method.

2. There is no innovation research. It is a systematic review of the data published on a specific topic.

3. Very good presentation of the data and also readability of the manuscript.

4.No ethical problems.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS MAY CONSIST OF THE FOLLOWING POINTS

Title: reflects the major topic and contents of the study.

Abstract: it gives a clear delineation of the review.

Materials and methods -

Results: provide sufficient studies to draw the conclusions.

Discussion: Very well organized with systematic analyses.

References:the references are appropriate, relevant, and updated.

Tables- tables are appropriately presented.

Response: Thank you for your positive comments. No revisions requested.

3 Three new references were added to the list (numbers 60, 61, 62). The format of the references has been confirmed to comply with the journal's requirements.

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

Sincerely,

Konstantinos Triantafyllou

Hepatogastroenterology Unit, Second Department of Internal Medicine and Research Institute, Attikon University General Hospital, Medical School, Athens University, Haidari, Greece

Fax: +30-210-5326422

E-mail: ktriant@med.uoa.gr