

Response to reviewers

We are extremely thankful for the review and comments given by the esteemed panel of reviewers.

We have responded point wise to all the queries of reviewers. Accordingly, the manuscript was modified and the modifications are highlighted.

We have also added 2 new references as we found that these articles are of extreme importance.

We have also modified the manuscript as per the instructions given by the editors

Reviewer 1 (No. 00068044)

1) It is mentioned in the second paragraph of introduction

2) Repetition has been corrected

3) Disadvantages of EUS drainage,

Disadvantages include the complications in the form of bleed, secondary infection, luminal perforation, incomplete drainage and stent migration. Multiloculated collections may fail to resolve completely with conventional EUS draining techniques. Lesions not close to luminal wall may not be accessible to EUS drainage. This has been added to the manuscript.

4) We have added a few prospective studies and metaanalysis

Reviewer 2 (No. 02510721)

1) Drainage is indicated in symptomatic PFCs, PFC related infection, bleed, luminal obstruction, fistulization and biliary obstruction.

2) Yes, Acute necrotic collections do not occur in first phase of SAP, but they develop prior to formation of WOPN. We have modified it in the manuscript for further clarity.

3) We have modified manuscript to clearly convey the message.

4) Yes, title has been modified as per your suggestion

Reviewer 3 (No. 02510223)

Thanks for the comments

Reviewer 4 (No. 00069827)

Thanks for the comments