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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would like to thank for the opportunity to revise this manuscript. This was a case report of eosinophilic gastroenteritis with little splinter haemorrhages on nails. The case has been sufficiently detailed and the provided figures are informative. I have just few comments. - There are some syntax typos throughout the manuscript (e.g., ascites who was/which was), as well as some words/sentences (e.g., non-passage of flatus, sluggish bowel sounds) which may be improved - Mid-night dietyl carbamazine test may be briefly explained. - What was the PMN and eosinophil cell count in the ascitic fluid? And ascitic albumin? Did ascites completely disappear after therapy? - What about esophageal biopsies? - Did the Authors investigate presence of asthma, rhinitis? - Why the Authors decided for a watchful waiting policy after steroid tapering? Did they take into account the option of immunosuppressants? It could be interesting to extend the follow-up after steroid tapering. Why the Authors decided 30 mg as starting dose of prednisolone? - Did the splinter hemorrhages disappear after steroids? This may be an important hallmark of correlation with EGD. - What about diet and dietary recommendations? - What about small bowel MRI instead of CT scan? Is there any study comparing diagnostic accuracy of these procedures? Any place for capsule endoscopy for the diagnosis of these disease? - The Authors spoke about avoidance of surgical intervention. However, CT scan did not reveal intestinal occlusion, volvulus, hernias. Please clarify. - The Authors said that this was a lethal disease. Can they provide some data about prognosis?
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the Authors fairly answered my previous comments.