

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS



June 1, 2019

Dear Editor:

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: Revised_manuscript 48307.2019.6.1).

Title: Prevention of post-ERCP pancreatitis using pancreatic stents: a review of efficacy, diameter and length

Authors: Mitsuru Sugimoto, Tadayuki Takagi, Rei Suzuki, Naoki Konno, Hiroyuki Asama, Yuki Sato, Hiroki Irie, Ko Watanabe, Jun Nakamura, Hitomi Kikuchi, Mika Takasumi, Minami Hashimoto, Takuto Hikichi, and Hiromasa Ohira

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

ESPS Manuscript No: 48307

The manuscript has been revised according to the reviewers' suggestions:

1 The format has been updated.

2 Revisions have been made according to the reviewers' suggestions.

Reviewer 1: well written manuscript. i have some suggestions.

1. what is the statistical method?

Response: Thank you for this comment. I added a SEARCH STRATEGY section (lines 88-95).

2. "ERCP can be life saving modality"(doi: 10.5505/jkarta1tr.2015.00372) and (doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.12996/gmj.2016.46) I suggest both of these related studies for the references.

Response: Thank you for suggesting these new references. However, doi: 10.5505/jkarta1tr.2015.00372 was not found, and the other reference was not written in English. For this study, we included only studies written by English (line 91).

Reviewer 2: This is a narrative review of the literature on stent placement to prevent post ERCP pancreatitis. although a large number of reviews already exist in the field of PEP prevention, this specific topic is interesting However, I have some major remarks regarding the paper :

1. The methodology is poor, with no material in a methods section and no reported search

strategy. As a consequence, the reference section needs to be updated and does not include most recent references on the topic (Sahar et al, Dig Endosc 2018; He et al, UEG journal 2018).

Response: Thank you for this comment. I added a SEARCH STRATEGY section (lines 88-95). We assessed the two studies recommended by Reviewer 2. However, we selected studies that compared the ability of different PSs to prevent PEP (lines 93-95). Therefore, we did not include the report written by Sahar et al.

We did not find a difference in a comparison between PSs with a flange and PSs without a flange in the prevention of PEP (He et al.) as shown in the title. We added the report written by He et al. (lines 159-172, lines 248-249, Table 3).

2. The outline of the paper needs clarification, and sections on pancreatic stent placement separated from the sections on specific literature review (RCTs, metaanalysis) Many sentences are vague and subjective.

Response: Thank you for this comment. First, many studies about prophylactic use of PSs for PEP have been reported; therefore, we limited RCTs and meta-analyses to comparisons between a stent group and a no stent group (lines 91-93). Furthermore, we added the specific data derived from the meta-analyses of RCTs (lines 148-152, Table 2).

3. Although the opinion of the authors is valuable, the numbers and p values should not be limited to the tables and also mentioned in the text.

Response: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We added the specific parameter values and *p* values to the text and Tables (Table 1-3, lines 109-110, lines 114-117, lines 148-152, lines 159-172, lines 179-180, lines 183-185, lines 187-188, lines 192-193, lines 203-204, lines 208-209, and lines 235-239).

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Meta-analysis*.

Sincerely,

Tadayuki Takagi, MD, Associate Professor

Department of Gastroenterology

Fukushima Medical University, School of Medicine

1 Hikarigaoka, Fukushima City, Fukushima Prefecture

960-1295, Japan

Tel.: +81-24-547-1202 Fax: +81-24-547-2055

E-mail: daccho@fmu.ac.jp