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Reviewer’s report:

Summary: This is a retrospective study over approximately 800 patients who had OGIB, of those 238 patients underwent both CE and DBE, of those 77 patients were excluded due to incomplete small bowel visualization, the rest of the patients were divided based on the capsule and endoscopic procedure in to 2 groups, angioectasia and non angioectasia groups. The authors sought to determine factors which may predict the presence of small bowel angiectasia and which is the best way to treat those angiectasia based on Yano – Yamamoto’s classification. Patients with angioectasia 1b were further divided in to 2 treatment groups 1 with single treatment with polidocanol injection and the second group with 2 treatment modalities such as PDI and APC or clipping. The question posed by the authors is well defined, the methods are appropriate and the discussion and conclusions are well balanced and adequately supported by the data except for one issue that I will discuss in the revision section.

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 angiectasia. Need to changed
2. Authors need to add section on study limitations……
3. Line 236-237 authors need to describe why they think that no statistical difference was found in between the 2 groups.

Additional minor comments:
1. Line 183, please explain if patients in the study were also had aortic stenosis.
2. Line 187 it will be valuable to know if patients among the 2 groups had different HVPG levels (if it was tested).
3. Some minor language correction
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