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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers’ comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Circular stripes were more common in Barrett's esophagus after acetic acid staining” (BMGE-D-17-00544). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer’s comments are as following:

Giuseppe Nicolò Fanelli, M.D. (Reviewer 1)

Response to comment of stressing the concept that about 60% of people with BE are asymptomatic in the results section, and you can add these data in table1;

Response: We are sorry for our negligence of forgetting to stress the concept that about 60% of people with BE are asymptomatic in the results section. We have added these data in table1 accordding to your suggestion.
2. Response to comment of the phrase "There is no doubt that BE has attracted....." is too informal;

Response: We have replaced "There is no doubt that BE has attracted....." with “Therefore” in line 40.

3. Response to comment of deleting spaces before fullstops.

Response: This is really a very low level mistake and we are sorry for that sincerely. We have made correction according to your comments in revised paper.

4. Response to comment of using the same font.

Response: We are sorry for using different font in our paper, we have corrected it in our manuscript.

Special thanks to you for your good comments!

Stefano Brignola (Reviewer 2):

Response to comment of repeated description of the AA's preparation at line 90 and line 96.

Response: We are sorry for the repeated description of the AA's preparation at line 90 and line 96. We have deleted it line 96.

2. Response to comment of data about correlation between gastroesophageal reflux and symptoms which are not present in the results or methods sections.

Response: The data is in The general characteristics of the subject, however as Reviewer suggested we have added these data to table 1.
Response: These are really very low level mistake and we are sorry for these sincerely. We have made correction according to the Reviewer’s comments in the content and marked in red in revised paper.

Special thanks to you for your good comments!

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper.

We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.