

Point-to-Point Responses to Reviewers' Comments
(Manuscript ID: 87167)

Dear editors and reviewers,

First of all, thank you very much for your email about the decision of our manuscript. And we appreciate for your thoughtful comments and excellent suggestions, which helped us to greatly improve our paper. According to the comments, we have made substantial changes to the manuscript to address your concerns. We hope that this revised manuscript is suitable for publication. Please see our point-by-point responses below regarding how we have addressed your concerns.

To Reviewer 1 Lian-Sheng Ma

1. I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. When revising the manuscript, it is recommended that the author supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript.

Response: Thank you for your appreciation. We further studied the latest studies of EGE and made sure that those studies which may enrich our article had already been added into references.

To Reviewer 2 Jia-Ru Fan

1. The manuscript is of good quality and has clinical value. However, little emphasis was given to the high incidence in children. There was no reference to eosinophilic antritis and hemorrhage with hematemesis. No reference was also made to experimental work carried out in France with vaccines that use enterogastritis cells from eosinophilic and germs in rats, which have shown to be effective in controlling cancer in those animals.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We focus on adult patients in EGE in this study and patients less than 18 years old were excluded from our cohort. Meanwhile, we also studied the work from French scientists you have mentioned. Our study focused on the long-term prognosis of EGE and did not

involve cancer control.

- 2. *The manuscript is well written, clear and deserves to be published. It would be good to add the possibility of upper gastrointestinal bleeding as it should be included among the causes of hematemesis.***

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We double-checked all patients' records in our cohort. No patient claimed to have upper GI bleeding so we did not list this item at first.

- 3. *Main manuscript content: The author clearly stated the purpose of the study and the research structure is complete. However, the manuscript still require a further revision according to the detailed comments listed below.***

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. Based on your detailed comments below, we corrected the format of our figures and tables and added 'author contribution' and 'article highlights' sections.

- 4. *Language evaluation: The English-language grammatical presentation needs to be improved to a certain extent. There are many errors in grammar and format, throughout the entire manuscript. Before final acceptance, the authors must provide the English Language Certificate issued by a professional English language editing company.***

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have already completed the language editing by MedE Editing Service and the certificate document is uploaded together.

On behalf of all authors:

Ji Li

Nov-28-2023