

Reviewer #1 Comments:

Fan et al in their manuscript entitled "Meta-analysis of pancreatic stent placement in preventing pancreatitis" evaluate the existing literature on this topic. The quality standards for inclusion are high and their methodology is sound. This is an interesting and valuable contribution.

Reply: Thank you very much for your comments.

Reviewer #2 Comments:

Pancreatitis is one of the most common and severe complications after ERCP. It can result in prolonged hospital stays and increased medical costs and might be life threatening to high-risk patients. Because PD stent placement can prevent pancreatic duct drainage impairment due to papillary edema or sphincter spasm, it might be an effective option to prevent PEP. It has been reported that pancreatic stent placement could prevent post-ERCP pancreatitis (PEP) by improving pancreatic drainage. The objective of this study was to investigate the efficacy and safety profile of PD stent placement for EPP prevention. Therefore, the title may be suggested to instead of "Update of meta-analysis of pancreatic stent placement in preventing pancreatitis post-ERCP". At the same time, there are a lot of major problems as follows: 1. These retrieved randomized controlled clinical trials of PD stent placement that were published clinical trials (15) in English or Chinese and had full texts (12) or abstracts (3), the abstracts were 20% and they can affect the reliability of results. So the abstracts may be suggested to be deleted. 2. In the stent group, 49 of the 1,233 (4.01%) patients suffered from PEP, compared to 133 of 1,277 (10.42%) in the no stent group. In the discussion should explain why pancreatitis occurs after stent placement. 3. The medication strategies were not included in the analysis, but the medication strategies may affect the results. So should be added in the paper. 4. The baseline disease of patients may be affected the reliability of results, So should be discussed in the paper.

Reply:

Thank you very much for your comments and suggestions, here below are our comments to your concerns and the contents that we've revised.

1. Concerning that data from abstracts may affect the result, we conducted another analysis in which data from abstracts were excluded. There was no difference between the result of this analysis and that of the former one in which all the data were included. We added both of them in our manuscript.

2. We added the paragraph in the discussion section of the manuscript.

3 and 4. Thank you very much for your suggestions. However, we found it difficult to analyze those two issues while conducting this meta-analysis. The key points we focused on is that if PD stent decreases the incidence of PEP, and different kinds of patients were involved in the studies we included in this study, so we think the study can reflect the clinical situation, though we

realized and confessed that lack of these analysis is one of the main limitations and shortcomings of our study. We listed the characteristic of patients in each study in Table 1.