ROUND 1

Responses to the Editor’s and Reviewer’s Comments

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers’ comments concerning our manuscript entitled “CT-3D reconstruction in the diagnosis of bleeding small intestinal polyps” (Manuscript NO.: 89957, CaseReport). 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.

Reviewer #1: Did the patient have EGD or colonoscopy before the capsule endoscopy? If not, please justify why capsule endoscopy was performed before EGD and colonoscopy.

Response to comment: The patient has been perfected in other hospitals for gastroscopy and colonoscopy. We have recorded the results in the text. We apologise that the gastroscopy and colonoscopy were not performed at our hospital and that the images could not be obtained for technical reasons.

Reviewer #2: What is the baseline hemoglobin of the patient before he began to have melena, or before single-balloon enteroscopy (SBE).

Response to comment: We have added in the text the haemoglobin values at the time the patient presented with black stools and prior to the small colonoscopy.

Reviewer #3: Please clarify the location of the polyp based on capsule endoscopy, i.e. what is the % small bowel transit time or small bowel progress of the polyp?

Response to comment: The polyp was detected when the magnetically controlled capsule endoscope was run to 4 hours 51 minutes.

Reviewer #4: Please clarify the direction of SBE. Was this antegrade or retrograde SBE?

Response to comment: Patients were examined by both transoral and transanal small enteroscopy. Final endoscopic treatment of polyps was performed under
transanal small enteroscopy. In the manuscript we refined this procedure.

Reviewer #5: *The polyp could be identified by capsule endoscopy alone without CT. Why was CT performed? please explain. What value does CT-3D add to the care of this patient?*

Response to comment: We have added to the discussion section the benefits of small bowel CT 3D reconstructive examination for the patient.

Reviewer #6: *Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)*

Response to comment: Thank you for the comment. We were very sorry about writing. This manuscript really needs language polishing. We have found a native English speaker to further polish the essay. We have made the revision in the paper.

Reviewer #7: *Table(s) and figure(s): There are 4 Figures should be improved.*

Response to comment: We rearranged images 1 and 3 in PPT to ensure that we could give editors the freedom to make changes. We apologise that images 2 and 4 are not available for editing.

Reviewer #8: *Please list all author and institutional information in order.*

Response to comment: We have listed all author and institutional information in order.

Reviewer #9: *Please add the author's contribution section.*

Response to comment: We have added the author's contribution section.

Reviewer #10: *Please add the Core tip section. The number of words should be controlled between 50-100 words.*

Response to comment: We have added the Core tip section.

Reviewer #11: *The main text of case report contains Introduction, Case presentation [(1) Chief complaints; (2) History of present illness; (3) History of past illness; (4) Personal and family history; (5) Physical examination upon admission; (6) Laboratory examinations; and (7) Imaging examinations], Final diagnosis, Treatment, Outcome and follow up, Discussion and Conclusion.*

Response to comment: We have improved the writing of case reports as
Reviewer #1: The last keyword should be “case report”.
Response to comment: We added the keyword “case report”.

Reviewer #1: The structure of Abstract does not meet the requirements. The abstract includes five parts: "BACKGROUND", "CASE SUMMARY", and "CONFUSION".
Response to comment: We have refined the "Background" section of the abstract to include the function and role of CT of the small intestine.

Reviewer #13: References: A total of 5 references are cited, including 1 published in the last 3 years. The reviewer didn’t request the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself.
Response to comment: This is rather true. However the references reflect the time period of the performance of our study. In addition, we have added a recent publication published in 2023 as reviewer’s suggestion.

ROUND 2
Responses to the Editor’s and Reviewer’s Comments
Reviewer: The previously raised concerns have been addressed but the manuscript needs English polishing.
Response to comment: Thank you for the comment. We were very sorry about writing. This manuscript really needs language polishing. We have commissioned a professional agency to touch up the article. The language of the article has reached the publication standard. And a proof of touch-up is issued, which we present in the attachment.