

## **Response to Reviewer #2 Comments**

We are grateful to the Reviewer #2 for the comments which we consider of great utility for the improvement of the present manuscript. We want to reply to the different comments as they were addressed:

**Point 1:** I recommend the authors to describe their paper as a 'narrative review'.

**Response 1:** we have described the paper as a “systematic review” based on a recommendation from the Science editor. Therefore, we have modified the manuscript following the guidelines of writing for systematic reviews of the World Journal of Gastroenterology.

**Point 2:** and to add a table summarizing the existing studies on GIP (authors, setting and n. of participants, kind of test, outcome) which could be very useful for the readers.

**Response 2:** we have modified Table 1, which summarize the selected studies for review about the use of GIP determination in the follow-up of patients with celiac disease in comparison with other existing tools such as serology, questionnaires, symptomatology and duodenal biopsy.

In addition, we added two more tables that we consider that may be useful for the understanding of the main results of the reviewed publications: one summarizing the rate of gluten-free diet transgressions in patients with celiac disease measured with the GIP test and the other existing tools (Table 4). The other table summarize the rate of gluten-free diet transgressions with the different tools in patients with/without mucosal atrophy by duodenal biopsy (Table 5).