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June 1, 2015

Editorial Board,
BMC Gastroenterology

To the Editors:

We thank you for the thorough review of our manuscript, “Major predictors and management of small-bowel angioectasia” which we submitted for publication as an Original Article. We have taken all of the reviewers’ comments into account and have made adjustments to the text accordingly. We herein submit our revised manuscript: the revisions are marked by single underlining.

We feel that our revisions are suitable in light of the reviewers’ comments, and we believe that the revised paper is significantly improved over the paper we submitted initially. We hope that the revised version is now acceptable for publication in BMC Gastroenterology.

Please do not hesitate to let us know whether there are any further changes we should make to the manuscript.

Yours sincerely,

Shiro Oka, MD, PhD
E-mail: oka4683@hiroshima-u.ac.jp
Department of Endoscopy, Hiroshima University Hospital, 1-2-3 Kasumi, Minami-Ku, Hiroshima 734-8551, Japan
Telephone: 81-82-257-5193, Facsimile: 81-82-257-5193
Point-by-point response to reviewers

# Reviewer 1: Anastasios Koulaouzidis

1) Correlation of Yano-Yamamoto and Saurin Classification in this cohort Use of reprint images for the above.

Reply: We have added a new Figure 1 (Yano-Yamamoto classification). For this reason, we changed the original Figure 1 to new Figure 2 (the study flow chart) and the original Figure 2 to new Figure 3 (Kaplan-Meier curves for post-procedural re-bleeding).

# Reviewer 2: Meir Mizrahi

Major Compulsory Revisions

1) Line 214 the authors write: “In this study, PDI was shown to be the treatment of choice”.... This is not a correct statement. The authors can’t state this because they didn’t compare different ways to treat angioectasia. Need to changed

Reply: Thank you for your comment. We agree with you and, according to the your suggestion, we have deleted the sentence, “In this study, PDI was shown to be the treatment of choice for type 1a angioectasia with oozing. “

2) Authors need to add section on study limitations......

Reply: We agree, and now note our study’s limitations in the Discussion section (Lines 244-246 of the Discussion, page 13, shown in under line).

3) Line 236-237 authors need to describe why they think that no statistical difference was found in between the 2 groups.
Reply: We hypothesize that the lack of statistical significance was due to the small number of participants, which we have now described in the Discussion section (Line 238-239 of the Discussion, page 12, shown in under line)

Additional minor comments:

1) Line 183, please explain if patients in the study were also had aortic stenosis.

Reply: We added a sentence in the Discussion section to explain that four patients in our sample had aortic stenosis (Line 187-188 of the Discussion, page 10, shown in under line)

2) Line 187 it will be valuable to know if patients among the 2 groups had different HVPG levels (if it was tested).

Reply: Unfortunately, HVPG levels had not been measured, so these data were not available.

3) Some minor language correction

Reply: Our manuscript has undergone additional language revision by some native speakers again.

# Chief editors comment
1) We recommend that you copyedit the paper to improve the style of written English.

Reply: Our manuscript has undergone additional language revision by some native speakers again. Please let us know if there are any incorrect sentences in the text.