

Guayaquil, December 2020

Bing Hu, MD

Anastasios Koulaouzidis, MD

Sang Chul Lee, MD, PhD

Editors-in-chief

World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Dear Editors,

We appreciate your patience in reviewing our article entitled” Cost-effectiveness of EUS-guided coils plus cyanoacrylate injection compared to endoscopic cyanoacrylate injection in the management of gastric varices”. We are moved by your feedback of considering our manuscript as different and a good application.

Below you will find a point-by-point letter addressing all the issues raised by the Science Editor. All changes were made within the manuscripts by using the MS track change mode for your reference. We sincerely hope to meet all the publishing requirements.

Yours sincerely,

Carlos Robles-Medranda, MD

Head of the Endoscopy Division

Instituto Ecuatoriano de Enfermedades Digestivas

Guayaquil, Ecuador

**Science editor comments:**

1. Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a clinical and translational research of the cost-effectiveness of EUS-guided coils plus cyanoacrylate injection compared to endoscopic cyanoacrylate injection in the management of gastric varices. The topic is within the scope of the WJGE. (1) Classification: Grade C, C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The authors aimed to compare the cost-effectiveness of treating gastric varices by cyanoacrylate injection; versus treating with coils plus cyanoacrylate guided by endoscopic ultrasound. From the findings, coils plus cyanoacrylate was cost-effective as compared to cyanoacrylate injection. The article is well written and will benefit the scientific community. However, some questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 3 tables and 4 figures. A total of 11 references are cited, including 1 reference published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations.

Response to the editor:

Dear editor, thank you for your patience in reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate the positive feedback provided to us and for considering our manuscript beneficial to the scientific community. We hope to successfully address all the recommendations and to meet the requirements for publication.

2. Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A and Grade A. A language editing certificate issued by SNAS was provided.

Response to the editor:

Dear editor, thank you the grading our manuscript accordingly.

3. Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, and the Institutional Review Board Approval Form. Written informed consent was waived. The authors should provide the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. However, the highest single-source similarity index showed to be 10% in the CrossCheck report. The authors need to rephrase the repeated parts.

Response to the editor:

Dear editor, in the following revision we have submitted a signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure and Copyright License Agreement, as requested. Also, within the attached Written informed consent form, there is a section stating that patients had approved the publication of the data related to the performed endoscopic procedure. Regarding, the single-source similarity index showing a 10% in the Crosscheck report, we have rephrased the repeated parts in order to avoid any inconvenience in the revised manuscript.

4. Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The topic has not previously been published in the WJGE.

Response to the editor: Dear editor, thank you for your comment. Indeed, this original article may be one of the first addressing the cost-effectiveness implications of gastric varices management.

5. Issues raised: (1) The “Author Contributions” section is missing. Please provide the author contributions; (2) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; (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; and (4) The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text.

Response to the editor: Dear editor, we have included the author contributions sections in the revised manuscript. Regarding the original pictures, we have uploaded all images independently in a high quality (300dpi). In terms of figure 3, that is a figure panel we have uploaded the figure panel in a Power Point document as recommended. The PMID and DOI number were included in the reference list, as well as listed all authors of the references. Finally, we have added the section “Article Highlights” at the end of the main text.

6. Re-Review: Not required.

Response to the editor: n/a.

7. Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Response to the editor: Thank you for accepting our manuscript for publication. We hope to fulfill all requirements following this revision.