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Dear Editor,

Finally, we have re-revised our manuscript according with the last Dr. Lorete Maria M da Silva Kotze’s suggestions. Here reported point-by-point reply. The corrections were highlighted in yellow in the revised text. All authors have approved the revised manuscript.

We are very happy that the reviewers are really satisfied with the changes we made and recommend our paper for publication. We are aware that with their contribution, now our paper is substantially improved and can add and support the current evidences published in the literature in this field.

Regarding to the last Dr. Lorete Maria M da Silva Kotze’s suggestions, we have accepted all the revisions proposed making a great effort in addressing all the objections moved. As epidemiologists, we want to contribute to the discussion in this important field with this our first population-based investigation. Now we are implementing a new survey based on a better representative sample by which we will try to deepen some of the aspects considered by reviewers. We hope that now our paper is fully suitable for publication.

With my Best Regards

Rosa Prato

*Corresponding Author*
**Point-by-point**

**Reviewer:** Lorete Maria M da Silva Kotze

**Q1.** I agree with the reviewer that showed new statistical revision is necessary.

A1. As suggested, we performed an extensive statistical revision.

**Q2.** Only 41.9% of the patients submitted to intestinal biopsy is a weakness point.

A2. We have just discussed this weakness in the previous revision. We stated it in the revised text where a clear assumption of such a limit of the study was defined.

**Q3.** They referred the probability of nutritional deficiencies involved in the problems, but they did not mentioned that the patients were undernourished. I demonstrated that the problems are independent of the nutritional status of the patients (KOTZE LMS - Gynecologic and obstetric findings related to nutritional staus and adherence to a gluten-free diet in Brazilian patients with celiac disease - J Clin Gastroenterol 2004: 38:567-74). So, more considerations are pertinent for explain the changes.

A3. Thank you for your good suggestion. The conclusion suggested in your paper was reported in the revised text.

**Q4.** The results could be distributed in the manner that the readers could understand easily the findings and the correlation with the clinical practice.

A4 We have accepted all the revisions suggested by you and the other reviewers. We are aware that with your contribution, now our paper is substantially improved and can add and support the current evidences published in the literature in this field.