Name of Journal: ***World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy***

ESPS Manuscript NO: 25471

Manuscript Type: Minireviews

Title: Endoscopic management of sigmoid volvulus in children

Authors: Filippo Parolini, Paolo Orizio, Anna Lavinia Bulotta, Miguel Garcia Magne, Giovanni Boroni, Gianpaolo Cengia, Fabio Torri, Daniele Alberti

Answer to Reviewer 1 (n. 41410)

Comment of the reviewer	**Answer**
The present paper is a review, in which total 39 article have been evaluated and 6 of them have been discussed widely. Do the authors have any experience on this subject?	Thank you. As this article is a review, analysis should be limited to published data. However, according to your suggestion, our personal experience with a patient with SV was add in the review (ref n 9).
2. Do all patients need nasogastric suction? If not, what are the contra-indications?	Evidence suggests that nasogastric tube placement should be attempted in all patients, and this point is remarked in "Which patients should be endoscopically managed?" section
3. Although to determine the presence (or absence) of bowel gangrene is possible in most of cases, what must be done in patients in which bowel gangrene can not be shown in clinical and radiological examination, but gangrene is seen in endoscopic treatment (or examination)?	According to your suggestion, this point has been remarked in "endoscopic procedure" section.
4. What can we do in patients in whom endoscopic examination shows borderline ischemia? (To answer is optional).	Evidence on this point is poor, but it has been remarked in "endoscopic procedure" section.
5. The authors can read 'The role of sigmoidoscopy in the diagnosis and treatment of sigmoid volvulus. Pak J Med Sci 32: 244-248, 2016	According to you suggestion this reference was added (ref n 10) and widely discussed in "endoscopic procedure" and "risks" sections.

Answer to Reviewer 2 (n. 02954023)

Comment of the reviewer	**Answer**
Although this invited manuscript is mostly well-written, authors should concern below points. 1. The abstract should not duplicate the main text especially "Introduction" section.	Thank you for your suggestions. Abstract was completely rewritten.
2. The authors should place citations in sentences of "Operative details" section.	According to your suggestion this statement was modified
3. The subhead "Operative details" (Page 6) which means details of "endoscopic procedure" not "surgical procedure", is misleading title for readers.	According to your suggestion this statement was modified to "Endoscopic proceurde".
4. To prevent excessive air insufflation, endoscopic procedure using water-immersion colonoscopy for sigmoid volvulus was reported in adults, suggesting safe, reasonable, conservative endoscopic approach.	According to your suggestions this method was cited in "Risks" section. Nevertheless, in emergency settings the experience of water-immersion colonoscopy in children is extremely limited.
5. The description of "Conflict-of-interest statement" differs in content.	According to your suggestion this statement was modified.
6. The subhead "BACKGROUND" (Page 4) should be changed appropriately.	According to your suggestion this point was changed from "background" to "Review"
7. The only first occurrence of a term "sigmoid volvulus" should be spelt out in full and the abbreviation "SV" should be used in the rest of the article.	According to your suggestion this point was modified.