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Dear Editor of BMC Gastroenterology

MS: 1483614691165985
Outcomes of endoscopic management of primary and refractory postcholecystectomy biliary leaks in a multicentre review of 178 patients

Thank you for allowing us to submit a revision of our manuscript.

We revised the manuscript according to the given suggestions and hope that it is suitable for publication in your journal in the present form. In the following, you can find our responses to the comments made:

Evaluations:

1 – Please provide the names of all IRBs which approved the study protocol

In Portugal retrospective studies, such as the current study are submitted to the ethics committee in order to use existent data in database records; in this situation the main concerns of the committee are always: 1) the investigators that are going to use the data should have been involved in the treatment of the patients as it is the case in current study (Jorge Canena, first author works in all included centers); 2) there will be no identification of patients by name, as it is the case in current study; 3) No prospective data should be included in the review as it is the case in current study

Ethics committee of Amadora-Sintra Hospital, ethics committee of Hospital Pulido Valente-Centro Hospitalar Lisboa Norte, ethics committee of Hospital dos Capuchos-Centro Hospital Lisboa Central and ethics committee of Hospital de Beja-Unidade Local de Saúde do Baixo Alentejo were the IRBs which approved the study protocol. This was included in the manuscript (methods section-patients and setting, page 8, line 160)

2 - Please rename the section Specific Author Contribution as Authors' Contributions and confirm that all authors read and approved the final manuscript, including a sentence to this effect at the end of the section.

We agree; it was changed and the sentence was included

3 - Please remove the sentence “This study was presented in part at APDW 2014, Bali, Indonesia, and this study was published in abstract form in J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2014;29 (Suppl 3): 1-O-001” from the Competing Interests section

Originally this sentence was included because several journals ask specifically if the
submitted manuscript was present in part as an abstract in a previous meeting. In this manuscript the sentence was removed.

We hope that we satisfactorily replied to all comments/suggestions and the revised manuscript is suitable for publication in BMC gastroenterology. We kindly ask you to contact us for any further information or suggestions you may require.

Yours sincerely,

On behalf of the co-authors

Jorge Canena