Roma 12/05/2022

Dear Editorial Office Director,

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to your e-mailed message.

My collaborators and I are pleased that our manuscript, entitled "**Commentary on "Endoluminal vacuum-assisted therapy to treat rectal anastomotic leakage: A critical analysis"**, has met the requirements for publication in the World Journal of Gastroenterology (Manuscript NO: 77136).

We have read the comments of the referees with interest. The manuscript has been reviewed considering the comments in your letter. In addition, the technical corrections requested have been carried out.

We have responded point by point to the suggestions of reviewers and this is shown below. Where we feel a change would improve the manuscript, this has been done and the change is highlighted in the text.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The authors wrote a comment on a review which comprehensively summarized the treatment of colorectal anastomotic leakage (AL) with endoluminal vacuum therapy. Except that the authors agree that EVT is a feasible strategy to treat AL already occurred, I think they mainly aimed to highlight the importance and strategies to prevent the onset of AL, but not the onset of complications of AL, as majority of this manuscript are discussing on basic mechanical patency tests, intra-operative fluorescence angiography with indocyanine green, diverting stoma, and TDT, all are strategies to decrease the incidence of AL. Therefore, the key sentence "It seems obvious to us that in case of AL it is better to prevent its complications rather than treat them once they have arisen" is not consistent with the emphasis of this comment. I also advice revision of the "Abstract" and "Core tip" correspondingly.

My co-workers and I thank Reviewer 1 for the compliments on our work.

In accordance with the reviewer's comments, the text of our comment has been changed. We have also modified the abstract and the core tip. We have underlined some aspects of the review published by Vignali and De Nardi.

The authors of the review have a remarkable clinical experience and scientific authority in colorectal surgery and related complications. The authors focus their attention on endoluminal vacuum therapy to treat anastomotic leakage in colorectal surgery. The authors highlight that most studies are heterogeneous in term of success rate definition, salvage and long-term results. Furthermore, there is paucity of comparative studies and thus definitive conclusions are not warranted at present time, as pointed out by the authors in their narrative review.

However, we believe it is important to underline the importance of different techniques and devices to reduce the incidence of anastomotic leakage in colorectal surgery.

Fondazione Policlinico Universitario Agostino Gemelli IRCCS
Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore

Dipartimento Scienze Mediche e Chirurgiche
Area Chirurgia Addominale
Largo Agostino Gemelli 8, 00168 Roma
T +39 06 3015 7073
giuseppe.brisinda@policlinicogemelli.it
www.policlinicogemelli.it

Sede Legale
Largo Francesco Vito 1, 00168 Roma
Sede Operativa
Largo Agostino Gemelli 8, 00168 Roma

Codice Fiscale e Partita IVA 13109681000

Reviewer #2:
Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Accept (General priority)
Specific Comments to Authors: This article provides a logical explanation of anastomotic leakage (AL), from its causes and classification to its treatment. I believe this article will help many readers understand the most troublesome postoperative complication, AL, and provide useful advice for future daily clinical practice.

My co-workers and I thank Reviewer 2 for the compliments on our work.

Reviewer #3:
Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)
Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)
Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: I would like to congratulate the authors for their commentary. I have no further recommendations

My co-workers and I thank Reviewer 1 for the compliments on our work.

Science editor: This is a letter to editor regarding a recent review published in WJG. The letter is well written. Please rewrite the abstract and core-tip.
Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)
Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

The core tip has been modified according to the Editor's suggestions.
The abstract has been modified according to the Editor's suggestions.
The manuscript was revised in accordance with the suggestions made by the reviewers. The text was revised and corrected by a native English speaker (Dr. Neill James Adams).

Thank You very much for your interest, we look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Giuseppe Brisinda