

We thank the Editor and Reviewers for the opportunity to revise our manuscript. Each reviewer comment has been responded to below.

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Major revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** The article is within the scope of the magazine, and deals with an interesting topic. It is well written and easy to read. The work carries out a review on pediatric patients with IBD. This is a novel and original work, which represents a great contribution by grouping works related to the area. However, it requires some improvements: a) A section that contextualizes the topic of the review should be included.

**Response:** This has now been incorporated into the 'Introduction' section (Paragraph 2).

b) It should be explained how the bibliographic review has been carried out: search and recovery criteria, databases used, time range...

**Response:** Given that this is not a systematic review, there was no specific search criteria used. This is now clarified in the manuscript, in the 'Introduction' section: "This is not a systematic review, but rather a focused review intended to summarize new changes and provide important clinical context".

c) A discussion section should be included in which the articles and lines of work found are compared, and the limitations they present and what the lines of future work would be are shown.

**Response:** The limitations and future research opportunities have now been added to the final section of the manuscript. Comparison of articles and lines of work is incorporated throughout the manuscript in the specific sections, rather than in the final

Discussion section, given that this is a focused review article and not an original research article.