

Dear Dr Jin-Lei Wang,

On behalf of my co-authors we would like to thank you for the suggestions made in the edited version of the manuscript and the reviewers for the careful and thoughtful review of our manuscript.

We have responded to the comments of the reviewers and the Editorial Office on a point-by-point basis and changes are marked in **yellow** color in the revised version of the manuscript.

Thank you for considering our revised manuscript for World Journal of Clinical Cases. We hope our paper will be of value in the field of celiac disease and useful for daily practice of gastroenterologists, internal medicine specialists and general practitioners.

We are open to further suggestions upon the indications of the Editorial Office.

Best regards,

Alina Dima, corresponding author

Response to reviewers

<i>Reviewer's comment</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Page in revised manuscript</i>
1. Reviewer's code: 00159281		
First please follow the instruction for authors and adjust the manuscript accordingly.	Changes were made in the revised form of the manuscript according to the instruction for authors and to the suggestions made by the Editor.	1-2
Second, try to produce a. What you have written in introduction is very little and nonspecific. Please set some criteria for coeliac crises. You can do that based on your literature review you have undertaken.	Introduction has been expanded with better definition for celiac crisis, its clinical features, diagnosis and treatment outline.	4-5
3rd, there is no need for such big table. Please summarize and break it down in 2 small tables; for instance one with clinical presentation of CC, and the other one with histology and other investigations	Tables have been summarized accordingly.	
4th for describing the histology please refer to the last Bucharest consensus: Rostami K, Marsh MN, Johnson MW, et al. Gut 2017;66:2080–2086	This has now been featured in the discussion section of the manuscript.	10
2. Reviewer's code: 00039368		
1. It is necessary to give	Appropriate explanations for	7,8

explanation to some abbreviations in the text, like "INR" and "GFR".	abbreviations were made on their first appearance in the manuscript.	
3. Reviewer's code: 02440884		
Comments 1. pathophysiological hypothesis could be more discussed and presented in detail.	The trigger factors or pathophysiological hypothesis are not well defined yet. The available data were included	5,7,10
4. Reviewer's code: 02541859		
You mention : A possible CC precipitating factor was described. It should be certain predisposing factors were found.	We kept the word "possible" because this is the way it was described in the original case-reports; it is difficult to affirm there is causal relationship, as there are so few cases reported for each of the triggers (infections, surgery, pregnancy). These could be well regarded as predisposing factors on a case-by-case analysis.	
5. Reviewer's code: 01555264		
1-Title: The type of review is not mention, please revise the title.	Title has been revised.	1, 4
2- I have't seen any abstract and keywords in the MS, please add.	The abstract and keywords are available in the edited, full version of the manuscript.	2, 3
3- the introduction is so short and little data regarding the	Introduction has been expanded with further	4, 5

celiac crisis was mentioned.	information.	
4- Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be define in the method clearly.	More explicit inclusion/ exclusion criteria were added in the methods section, which are also highlighted in the accompanying flowchart.	5
5- Please revise the table and omit some unimportant data.	Tables have been summarized accordingly.	14-18
6- discussion is not follow the journal instruction please revise it.	We regarded the journal instruction and we added the information missing for the end of the manuscript.	10-13