

## **Responses to reviewers**

**Name of journal:** World journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript Number:** 44987

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for the opportunity to resubmit our revised manuscript. We also thank you for the reviewers' constructive suggestions and comments concerning our manuscript entitled **“Evaluation of A Clinical Pathway on Endoscopic Retrograde Cholangiopancreatography for Chinese Patients with Common Bile Duct Stones: A Retrospective Study of Big-Data Analysis”** (ID: 44987). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Our point-by-point answers to the reviewers' comments are below, with amendment in blue. We hope that the revised manuscript is now acceptable for publication. We look forward to hearing from you.

### **Reviewer Comments:**

#### **Reviewer 1 (03000523):**

Dear Editor, with a great interest I read the manuscript entitled Evaluation of A Clinical Pathway on Endoscopic Retrograde Cholangiopancreatography for Chinese Patients with Common Bile Duct Stones: A Retrospective Study of Big-Data Analysis The manuscript covers important aspects of clinical work. Although retrospective in design manuscript is well written and adds

possible solutions for clinical practice. The conclusions are well funded in results which came out after rigorous statistical analysis.

**Response: Thank you very much for your thorough review and the positive comments regarding our manuscript.**

**Reviewer 2 (01799105):**

This is a publishable original study. I corrected the English of the text and attached. The content of some of the references may not be relevant to the text. Therefore, that should be reviewed.

**Response: We are grateful for your kind comment and your correction. According to your kind suggestion, our manuscript was polished carefully once again. Besides, we have checked our references and make sure it is relevant to our text. All changes are shown with Track Changes in the manuscript. Hope it could meet with your approval.**

**Reviewer 3 (00070271):**

I do not have any comments for the authors. They clearly establish the strengths of their study as well as the limitation of being a retrospective study carried out in only one hospital center.

**Response: We appreciate the careful reading of our manuscript and positive suggestions for our study.**