

Answering Reviewers

1. Is this the correct e-mail address for the corresponding author?

xxxzzzyy@foxmail.com

Yes, it is.

2. There are a few minor errors in the text, please check grammar, spelling and the use of spacing.

We revised few minor grammar, spelling errors and the use of spaces.

3. End of page 5, (Biodyne, Seongnam, Korea) is mentioned twice?

This is a repetitive statement. We deleted it.

4. Page 6, I suggest the search string be moved into supplementary material. Please check the correct amount of brackets used, and the use of wildcard as pancreatic and pancrea* would essentially yield the same result. I am unable to reproduce your results, when I try to perform the search?

We deleted "pancrea*".

5. End of page 6 in the study Selection section, please clarify what is the reference standard.

We have already described reference standard on page 8.

6. Page 7, end of Data extraction section, I hope that this is merely a spelling error, but sensitivity is calculated as $TP/(TP+FN)$

It is a spelling error and we revised it.

7. Page 7, Risk of bias section: you state that quality assessment was independently assessed, by whom? And how many authors? This is a crucial methodological question, as it affects the interpretation of the results.

We added these information to the quality assessment on page 7.

8. Page 8, Results/study selection section: "Thus, 8 studies[7-14] with a total of x patients were ultimately eligible for the meta-analysis". What is x studies?

Furthermore, it would seem that the section is repeated twice.

This is a clerical error. The correct sentence should be “Thus, 8 studies with a total of 1656 patients were ultimately eligible for the meta-analysis”. We also deleted the repetitive section.

9. Page 9, Diagnostic performance section. You construct 2x2 tables, but I don't recall reading about the definitions of positive and negative outcome? Is it positive or negative for malignancy? This needs to be specified.

We added a sentence “According to the reference standard, the definitions of positive and negative outcomes are malignancy and benign, respectively” to better explain the problem.

10. There is a very high heterogeneity between the study, so I would suggest a more cautious approach when concluding that there is a difference between the methods.

We verify the stability of the conclusion through sensitivity analysis, and verify whether there are differences among the three different inspection methods through Turkey test. We think that the conclusion drawn in this paper is credible.

11. Furthermore, you mention apparent publication bias in Discussion section, as a majority of the studies originated from Asia. I am afraid that this is not the definition of publication bias. The latter occurs when the results of one study, influences the decision to publish the study or not. Publication bias is usually examined through funnel plots of standard error as a function of the effect size, and corresponding statistical tests.

We deleted this part of the sentence.