

It is required to strengthen relevance of topic in the introduction section.

Thank you very much for your comments/suggestions.
We have edited the Introduction section as suggested.

The data and results section requires minor corrections.

Thank you very much for your comments/suggestions.
We have edited the data/results section as suggested.

Discussion – requires supplementing with information about advantages and disadvantages of the analyzed methods of drainage with stents.

Thank you very much for your comments/suggestions.
Supplemental information has been added.

Abstract is too long

Thank you very much for your comments/suggestions.
The abstract has been shortened.

Misinformation – EUS-GBD is being increasingly used as a bridge to cholecystectomy.

Thank you very much for your comments/suggestions. This sentence has been edited to avoid misleading statements.

Aims need to be revisited.

Thank you very much for your comments/suggestions.
The aim of the study has been clearly stated.

Methodology and study design not standard.

Thank you very much for your comments/suggestions.

The methodology and study design was based on the available evidence to date. Several of the papers included in the study were case series and some papers included only one arm (trans-gastric or trans-enteric) for gallbladder drainage. There is no prospective study comparing transgastric versus transenteric EUS guided gallbladder drainage.

Discussion needs to be result oriented.

Thank you very much for your comments/suggestions.
The discussion section has been edited as suggested.

Conclusion is not yours.

Thank you very much for your comments/suggestions.

Our conclusion is based on the evidence available on this topic. We also clearly state the limitations of the study and conclude that further research is required on this topic before any recommendations can be made based on the GRADE methodology.