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Reviewer's report:

In the present study, the Authors aimed to investigate the value of double-balloon enteroscopy (DBE) for diagnosis of isolated small bowel Crohn's disease (CD). This is so valuable study, however I have some questions and comments, which should be addressed by the Authors.

Major comments

1. The study design appears confused because DBE was used as a diagnostic tool and also an activity detector in the present study. I think that the Authors did not need to evaluate CD activity or respond to treatment. In the current study, DBE was just used as a diagnostic tool in suspected isolated small bowel CD. Thus the Authors should omit the part of the paper that does not include diagnostic estimation of DBE for making the diagnosis of isolated small bowel CD.

2. In the material and method, the Authors mentioned that EGD, colonoscopy, CTE or enhanced computed tomography (CT), and VCE were done in some cases. CTE and VCE were performed in just some cases, although all patients underwent CT (table 1). CT is satisfactory for the suspicion of small bowel CD. The Authors might exclude the results of CTE and VCE from the main text and tables.

3. This study is also not a surveillance study, so Authors should omit surveillance results and information like "three patients underwent DBE surveillance after treatment and were found to improve, on the basis of endoscopic images…".
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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