

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments on our manuscript entitled "Obesity is associated with colitis in women but not necessary causal relationship" (Manuscript NO.: 77478, Letter to the Editor). According to your comments and requirements, we have made some modifications to the original manuscript, hoping to pass it. The modified parts in the text are marked in red pen. The main corrections in the paper and the responses to the reviewers' comments are as follows:

Reviewer #1:

- 1) Response to comment: I was honored to review the manuscript entitled: Anti-obesity effect of Eucalyptus leaf extract containing oeno-thein B in healthy Japanese adults: A randomized, place-bo-controlled, double-blind, parallel-group study submitted to Nutrients. The study presents high quality and deals with important clinical issue, such type of study is needed. I have only few small remarks that authors should address properly. I recommend to accept the manuscript after minor revision.

Response: Thank you for your approval, but I don't quite understand what you said. My title is "Obesity is associated with colitis in women but not necessary causal relationship". I submitted it to the World Journal of Clinical Cases.

- 2) Response to comment: There are only some points to correct: 1. please provide the list of abbreviations; 2. please provide the number of ethical approval; 3. introduction and discussion section need improvement; 4. please provide information on how your results will translate into clinical practice;

Response: Thank you for your criticism. 1: You can try to explain where the abbreviation list is. 2. I don't know what you mean, this article doesn't use any experimental data, so I don't think there should be any the number of ethical approval. 3: This manuscript has no introduction and discussion part. 4: This suggestion is a bit overwhelming for me. You seem to be lost there.

- 3) Response to comment: In discussion section please provide study strong points and study limitation section, please correct typos All above mentioned issues are crucial for the credibility of the results. The paper can be accepted only after addressing all the issues and another subsequent review. I recommend to accept the manuscript after

minor revision.

Response: This article has no discussion part. We also believe that questions are crucial to the credibility of the results. Thank you again for your comments.

Reviewer #2:

- 1) Response to comment: This article by Wei Shen and Lianping pointed out the crucial issues of the study by Robert S Sandler, such as factors influencing the conclusion and whether oral contraceptives can reduce the risk of microscopic colitis.

Response: Thank you for agreeing with us.

- 2) Response to comment: The authors also raised limitations of the telephone interviews and self-completed questionnaires, including the authenticity of the data. Taken together, the authors emphasized the caution in the reliability of Sandler's conclusions. Thus, the readers should interpret the study results with caution. This article can be useful for the readers.

Response: Thank you for your approval, and we will continue to improve.

- 3) Response to comment: Comments/suggestions 1. The abstract can be more concise. "The relationship between obesity and female risk of microscopic colitis remains to be discussed." is sufficient.

Response: We have changed the abstract to " The relationship between obesity and female risk of microscopic colitis remains to be discussed."

Line 2, page 2, Abstract "Chronic diarrhea is not necessary caused by microscopic colitis, but diarrhea can cause weight loss. The relationship between obesity and female risk of microscopic colitis remains to be discussed." were corrected as "The relationship between obesity and female risk of microscopic colitis remains to be discussed."

We did our best to make some changes to the manuscript. These changes will not affect

the content and framework of the paper. We don't list the changes here, but mark them in red in the revised documents. We sincerely thank the editors/reviewers for their enthusiastic work, and hope that the revision will be approved. Thank you again for your comments and suggestions.