

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS

Oct 20, 2018

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format.

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 41744

Title: Evaluating mucosal healing using colon capsule endoscopy predicts outcome in patients with ulcerative colitis in clinical remission

Author: Ryosuke Takano, Satoshi Osawa, Takahiro Uotani, Shinya Tani, Natsuki Ishida, Satoshi Tamura, Mihoko Yamade, Moriya Iwaizumi, Yasushi Hamaya, Takahisa Furuta, Hiroaki Miyajima and Ken Sugimoto

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

1 Format has been updated

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer, as follows

To reviewer 1

1. What is the primary study endpoint? Authors evaluated different outcomes. If the primary end point of the study was prediction of the relapse free interval in patients with ulcerative colitis in clinical remission, was the sample size calculated accordingly?

Thus, the sample is not only small but it's also unjustified.

Reply: Thanks for your critical criticism. We are aware of them as well. In the revised manuscript, we stated this issue in discussion session as follows. "There were several limitations to this study. First, since this study was designed as a preliminary study, a small number of patients were enrolled. ----" (Page 19, Line 5-6) We also revised the aim of the abstract to present another end point of this study (Page 4, Line 2-4).

2. The study is not controlled with conventional colonoscopy. -----

Reply: Thanks for the comment. We added a limitation of our study about this issue.
(Page 19, Line 10-11)

3. Results section, effectiveness of colon cleansing. "Although the cleansing level of cecum and ascending colon was lower, the overall rate was within the permissible range."
What is the permissible range?

Reply: Thanks for your criticism. This sentence is not necessary. We deleted this sentence because it would be misleading to the reader (Page 14, Line 6).

4. Both intro and discussion are lengthy

Reply: Thanks for your suggestion. I deleted several sentences in discussion.

5. The statement "Therefore, it has a high level of patient acceptance without anesthesia" in the introduction section, is not supported by the literature. Actually, there is no evidence either in favor or against this statement

Reply: Thanks for your criticism. This sentence means that anesthesia is not necessary at all in capsule endoscopy, whereas it is sometimes necessary for colonoscopy. There is no evidence about this statement. We believe that this is a general matter.

6. Please define CAI score in the abstract.

Reply: Thanks for the suggestion. In revised manuscript, CAI score has been defined in abstract. (Page 4, Line 7-8)

To reviewer 2

7. There are some minor issues to be addressed by the authors: The number of cases is rather small.
So, this is a preliminary study. This should be stated by the authors.

Reply: Thanks for your suggestion. We agree with your appropriate suggestion. In the revised manuscript, we stated this issue in discussion session as follows. "There were several limitations to this study. First, since this study was designed as a preliminary study, a small number of patients were enrolled. —" (Page 19, Line 5-6)

8. How could the authors score separately each part of the colon? That definition would be I guess rather empiric and arbitrary. I would like the authors to comment on that please, explaining how we can distinguish parts and the position of the capsule in the colon.

Reply: Thanks for your comment. The hepatic flexure and splenic flexure which had been automatically determined by the software were reconfirmed and used as markers to separate the segment in the colon. We added this sentence in the revised manuscript (Page 10, Line 4-6).

9. There is no direct comparison with colonoscopic findings. That would add value to the study. I would like the authors to comment on that.

Reply: Thanks for a kind comment. We added a sentence about this issue in discussion section as follows. "There was no direct comparison between CCE-2 and CS findings in our study, by which the value of this study would be further increased." (Page 19, Line 10-11)

To reviewer 3

10. The manuscript is of interest for gastroenterologists and endoscopists. The results are very relevant and could have a role in the follow-up of UC patients with clinical remission. In my opinion these data need to be confirmed using colonoscopy as the gold-standard procedure.

Reply: Thanks for a kind comment. We added a sentence about this issue in discussion section as follows. "There was no direct comparison between CCE-2 and CS findings in our study, by which the value of this study would be further increased." (Page 19, Line 10-11)

3 We added "ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS". (Page 20-21)

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Clinical Cases*.

Sincerely yours,

Satoshi Osawa, M.D., Ph.D.

Department of Endoscopic and Photodynamic Medicine,

Hamamatsu University School of Medicine

1-20-1 Handayama, Higashi-ku, Hamamatsu 431-3192, Japan.

E-mail: sososawa@hama-med.ac.jp

TEL: 81-53-435-2261

FAX: 81-53-434-9447