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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 “Jejunogastric intussusception after Whipple procedure with Roux-en Y reconstruction: a case report” (ID: BMGE-D-19-00348). 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. Revised portion are marked in red in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer’s comments are as flowing:

Response to the reviewer’s comments:

Manabu Kawai (Reviewer 1):

This case report was well revised based on reviewer’s comments about jejunogastric intussusception after Whipple procedure. However, there is one problem. I asked whether authors show the figure for reconstruction of Whipple procedure with Roux-en Y reconstruction. Unfortunately, I could not find out a new figure, although authors replied that they provided a simple diagram of the two methods. Authors might have just forgotten to put it on the revised manuscript.

Response : Thanks for your comment on our manuscript. We are so sorry to make a mistake in our title of manuscript. The method of reconstruction in our patient was Whipple's procedure (duct-to-mucosa pancreaticojejunostomy and side-to-side gastrojejunostomy) with B-II reconstruction. So, we can’t provide the figure of Rou-en-Y reconstruction. We have revised the manuscript.

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. And here we did not list the changes but marked in red in revised 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