

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: It is a good review on the prevalence, epidemiology and pathophysiology of this AP sequelae and diabetes as a consequence of acute pancreatitis. Thank you for taking the time to read our mini review. We have added more references to help increase the scientific quality of the paper. We have polished the language and strived to remove forms of colloquialism.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: In that review, Ericka Charley et al. provided a clear introduction to the background and pathophysiological characteristics of diabetes associated with acute pancreatitis (DEP). They proposed a set of possible diagnostic criteria, which provided guidance for the accurate diagnosis of DEP. Furthermore, the paper extensively discussed the management strategies for DEP, including pancreatic enzyme replacement therapy and vitamin supplementation. The authors also suggested future research directions, such as utilizing artificial intelligence and biomarkers to further deepen the understanding of DEP. They emphasized the need for further research to develop more comprehensive diagnostic and management guidelines. Overall, this review provided valuable information for understanding and addressing diabetes associated with acute pancreatitis, exerting a positive impact on research and clinical practice in the relevant field. There are a few minor issues: 1. There is a limited number of cited references. It is recommended to conduct further literature search and updates. 2. It is necessary to present contrasting viewpoints to stimulate deeper thinking and discussion on the topic.

We sincerely appreciate you taking the time to read our mini review and providing us with constructive feedback.

1. Although the information and papers available on our topic are limited we did conduct a deeper literature search. We were able to add a few more papers that have more up-to- date findings. These papers also helped us provide even more information on the topic in general.
2. We understand the utility in presenting contrasting view points to help stimulate different ideas about the topic. This definitely helps shine light on how one area of focus needs to be viewed from multiple different angles. To help address your recommendations we added information about studies contrasting what was previously known about certain subject matters such as vitamin D and its role in glucose control. We hope these additions also added to the scientific quality of the paper.

Again, thank you for taking the time to read our review and helping us strive for a better quality paper.