

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS

November 15, 2014

Dear Editor,



Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 13556-review.doc).

Title: Head mass in chronic pancreatitis - Inflammatory or malignant

Author: Amit K Dutta, Ashok Chacko

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 13556

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

Reviewer 1: I read with interest the review article by Chacko et al. The article is well-written. I have following suggestions- 1. Authors should discuss molecular techniques in a bit more detail; especially proteomics. 2. Authors have provided an algorithm towards the end of the paper, however, this algorithm does not appear to be appropriate. I suggest authors should either revise it (based on evidence from current literature) or omit it altogether.

Response: We thank the reviewer for the positive comments and suggestions

1. We have discussed the molecular techniques including proteomics in more detail as suggested.
2. We have omitted the algorithm

Reviewer 2: No comment

No response required

Reviewer 3: I really think that more needs to be discussed regarding FNA and what molecular markers are necessary. Also, you give an algorithm but don't state what exactly would make you pick one arm vs the other. The language is otherwise good.

Response:

- 1) We thank the reviewer for the suggestion. We have discussed the role of EUS FNA in detail and suggested the use of multiple rather than one molecular marker based on current data.
- 2) We have omitted the algorithm

Response to Editor's comments:

Formatting has been done as suggested. The bibliography includes all author names, PMID number and DOI number wherever available. Reference 3 is a textbook and we could not get DOI or Pubmed ID.