

Reply to the Reviewer/Editor.

Dear Respected Editor/Reviewer

Good day

Thank you very much for the comprehensive review and the precious time you spent reviewing this study. We did the advised changes and answered the queries. All the changes were marked in red for easy tracking by the reviewer. The manuscript looks much better with these changes, and we tried to improve the language as we could.

Thank you again for your precious assistance.

Here we are replying point by point:

Reviewer 1:

Specific comments: please see the attached manuscript.

1 Title. The title reflects the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript

Our reply: Thank you

2 Abstract. please modify the abstract to specify the purpose of the study

Our reply: The purpose was added

2.1 Abstract. Please change the abstract to be a maximum of 200 words as per the guidelines

Our reply: According to the journal guidelines, the abstract should not be less than 200 words. However, we reduced it to 250 words.

3 Keywords. the keywords reflect the focus of the manuscript

Our reply: Thank you

4 Core Tips: please check for typos

Our reply: We checked the core tips, and any typos were corrected and highlighted in red

5 Background. the manuscript adequately describes the background, present status, and significance of the study

Our reply: Thank you

6 Methods. please describe methods

Our reply: Methods were added and highlighted in red
7 Line 74: please add a reference and better explain the effect on microbiota

Our reply: The requested changes were done, reference was added, Changes are highlighted in red.

8 Line 92-94: Please add a reference

Our reply: Two references were added.

9 Line 102: Please correct the incomplete sentence

Our reply: Actually, the sentence was complete

The role of other kinds of immune-mediated reactions to CMP, especially those associated with IgG and IgA antibody isotypes, is presently controversial.

10 Line 107: Please correct the repetition in the sentence (with increasing age or with age?)

Our reply: The repetition was deleted.

11 Line 121-122: please correct the sentence in order to delete the duplicate

Our reply: The duplication was corrected.

12 Line 128: please add a reference and better explain how sensitization can occur before birth

Our reply: Reference was added with more explanation.

13 Line 155: please better explain how EoE can be similar to CMPA

Our reply: EOE is one of the presentations of CMPA. It can be triggered by various allergens and food particles such as CMP. We clarified this in the manuscript.

14 Line 165: please add a reference and better explain "in utero sensitization"

Our reply: This was previously added in your previous comment.

15 Line 176: please better explain the background of these laboratory works

Our reply: The explanation was done. Changes are highlighted in red.

16 Line 211-212: please add a reference for the quote " ...traces of milk as small as 0.3 mg of CMPs"

Our reply: Reference 40 is the reference for this quote. Already there (the current number is reference 48 after adding some references).

17 Line 239: which patients and controls do you refer to? Please correct or extend the sentence

Our reply: What We mean by this phrase is due to the increased prevalence of lactose intolerance compared to CMPA, some of the cases of CMPA were wrongly diagnosed as lactose intolerance. It does not compare patients or control. Explain of misdiagnosis of CMPA with Lactose intolerance. Clarification was done and highlighted in red.

18 Line 240-241: please correct the sentence in order to delete the duplicate (adult/adulthood)

Our reply: Duplication was removed.

19 Line 267-272: maybe you can move these sentences in the childhood paragraph

Our reply: We do believe that the current position is ideal.

20 Line 413-414: please add a reference

Our reply: Line 314 and 414 already have reference [89] we added reference 63.

21 Line 497: Please complete the sentence

Our reply: We revised the sentences from references 112 to 114, we did not find any incomplete sentences.

22 Line 519-522: please add a reference

Our reply: Reference was added.

23 Line 544: please add a reference for Carroccio et al

Our reply: Reference was added.

24 Discussion. Please revise the manuscript in order to highlight the key points concisely, clearly, and logically and to discuss the scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice

Our reply: The whole manuscript was revised

25 Conclusion: please expand the conclusion

Our **reply:** Conclusion was expanded

25 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Please revise the manuscript in order to organize it concisely and coherently.

Our reply: Revision was done

25 Please revise the manuscript style, language, and grammar

Our reply: Revision was done

26 Please revise the English

Our reply: Revision was done

27 Please check for typos

Our reply: Revision was done

Reviewer 2:

This editorial is very helpful for understanding cow's milk-associated GI disorders.

Our reply: Thank you very much.

Only some minor grammar and typing errors need to be revised.

Our reply: We revised the manuscript by an editing company and improved the quality of the manuscript

If the role of microbiota in the interplay between cow milk and GI is established and discussed, it will be great.

Our reply: Discussion of the role of Microbiota was added

Reviewer 3:

It is an interesting manuscript.

But Authors cannot succeed to present their idea in a clear way by adding information to the existing literature.

Our reply: We made it clearer

What are the original findings of this manuscript?

Our reply: This is an editorial for special issues trying to summarize all the topics about the effects of cow's milk on the gastrointestinal health of humans in that issue.

It is suggested that the article should be supplemented with diagrams and tables for clarity.

Our reply: we added one diagram and one table