

ANSWERS TO REVIEWERS

We thank the Referees for their interest in our work and for helpful comments that will greatly improve the manuscript and we have tried to do our best to respond to the points raised. The Referees have brought up some good points and we appreciate the opportunity to clarify our research objectives and results.

As indicated below, we have checked all the general and specific comments provided by the Referees and have made necessary changes accordingly to their indications.

1.COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors mention that the manuscript was selected by an Editor and has undergone external peer review. When was this done? The authors keep suggesting 'treatment' or 'treating' patients with pancreatitis. The reality is we can only manage these patients. Not treat them as there are no specific treatments for AP. All we do is manage the complications or attempt to prevent the complications from happening. The authors suggest that the rationale for the study is because CECT is not feasible in all patients due to cost, allergic risks and logistics. Yet, they suggest the use of endothelial progenitor cells?! This to me seems counter intuitive. Determining endothelial progenitor cells is so complex that it is not readily available around the world.

Answering reviewers: We will continue study endothelial progenitor cells on as a specific treatments for AP.

2.COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Minor comments: 1) Please remove comment from Figure 1. 2) In the methods, the cell concentration should be 1×10^5 (please correct). 4) Last paragraph: It should be "LIMITATION".

Answering reviewers:

- 1) Please remove comment from Figure has done.
 - 2) In the methods, the cell concentration should be 1×10^5 had yet corrected.
 - 3) Results: 1st paragraph, line 7 -> It should be "sequentially" yet.
 - 4) Last paragraph: It had been "LIMITATION",
- All comments has been revised in 31443-Revised manuscript.