

## **Revision and Response**

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Medical imaging for pancreatic diseases: Prediction of severe acute pancreatitis complicated with acute respiratory distress syndrome". Those comments are all valuable and very rewarding for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made corrections, which we hope meet with approval. Revised portions are marked in red in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the response to the Editorial Comments and Reviewers' Comments are given as follows.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Editorial Comments:**

1. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript.

Response: Thank you for this editorial comment. We have embodied it in the future trends and prospects of the article.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Responds to the Reviewer Comments:**

1. Response to comments (Reviewer #2): "1. In order to provide an easy-to-understand explanation for the reader, please present a chest CT image associated with acute pancreatitis."

Response: Special thanks to you for your reminder. We agree with the reviewer's perspective. At the end of the article, we have added four CT images of severe acute pancreatitis related to acute respiratory distress syndrome and illustrated them.

2. Response to comments (Reviewer #2): "2. Please also describe the PaO<sub>2</sub>/FiO<sub>2</sub> ratio and pancreatitis severity."

Response: Special thanks to you for your good comments. We agree with the reviewer's perspective. We added the definition of PaO<sub>2</sub>/FiO<sub>2</sub> and its potential relationship with the severity of acute pancreatitis. We have written this part according to the reviewer's suggestion, as shown in Page 4, line 88-92,100-101; and Page 5, line 115-118.

3. Response to comment (Reviewer #1): "1. This article is well described about prediction of pulmonary dysfunction in AP. It is worth reading for clinicians who see patients with AP."

Response: Special thanks to you for your good comments and your approval.

#### **Responds to the Re-reviewer Comments:**

4. Response to comments (Re-reviewer): "This paper has been properly revised."

Response: Special thanks to you for your good comments and your approval.

\*\*\*\*\*

Moreover, (1) we added a reference published in *Intensive Care Med*: "Villar J, et al. A universal definition of ARDS: the PaO<sub>2</sub>/FiO<sub>2</sub> ratio under a standard ventilatory setting—a prospective, multicenter validation study. *Intensive Care Med* 2013;39: 583–592." (2) We have made corrections to meet the journal's preferred format (Red font marks in the text and core tip). (3) We have checked that all final authors are properly listed on the revision submission.

\*\*\*\*\*

To sum up, we tried our best to improve the manuscript and we had made corrections according to the reviewers' comments and editorial comments. All of changes did not affect the content and framework of the paper. We appreciate for Editors' and Reviewers' warm work earnestly, and we hope that the corrections will meet with approval.

Once again, thank you very much for editorial and reviewer's comments and suggestions.

Yours

Sincerely,

Bo XIAO

(Email: xiaoboimaging@163.com)

2022-10-15