

Reviewer #1: Although the findings that PSGL-1 deficiency prevents the development of acute pancreatitis by attenuating leukocyte infiltration are interesting, a number of points need clarifying and certain statements require further justification. These are given below.

1. Details of PSGL-1^{-/-} mice should be described. The authors only described that “PSGL-1^{+/+} and PSGL-1^{-/-} mice were obtained from Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, University of Oklahoma Health Science Center”. Most of readers cannot understand how the knockout mice were established. Whether the mice were established by Yang, J. et al. (J. Exp. Med. 190, 1769-1782, 1999) should be clarified.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. The description “*PSGL-1^{+/+}* and *PSGL-1^{-/-}* mice were generous gifts from Dr. Xia, the department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, University of Oklahoma.” was added in “Materials and method” of the manuscript and marked in red.

2. The authors described, “All patients and volunteers signed the informed consent form, which was approved by hospital's ethics committee (QT19012)”. Please provide the approval number and approval date.

Response: We have carefully checked the relevant documents. The corrected approval number is QT19012. The approval date is 2017-10-15. They were corrected in “Materials and methods” of the manuscript and marked in red.

3. The authors described, “All experimental protocols were approved by the Animal Care and Use Committee at the Institute of Laboratory Animal Science, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences and Peking Union Medical College (YZW19007)”. Please provide the approval number and approval date.

Response: We have carefully checked the relevant documents. The approval number is YZW19007. The approval date is 2019-03-20. They were corrected in “Materials and methods” of the manuscript and marked in red.

4. The authors described, “The inflammatory cytokines IL-1beta and IL-6 in the serum or supernatant were tested by ELISA kits”. What ELISA kit(s) were used should be described.

Response: The details of **ELISA kits** were described in “Materials and methods” of the manuscript and marked in red.

5. The authors described, “TUNEL assay was performed according to the instructions of the TUNEL kit” without describing what kit was used. What kit was used should be described.

Response: The details of the TUNEL kit were described in “Materials and methods” of the manuscript and marked in red.

6. In Materials and Methods, “providers (city, country [State])” should be clearly described. For example, “Sigma (USA)” should be changed to “Sigma (St. Louis, MO)”; “Selleck” should be changed to “Selleck (Huston, TX)”.

Response: The materials information was clearly described in “Materials and methods” of the manuscript, and marked in red.

7. The manuscript contains multiple errors in English writing; therefore, it should be checked by native English speakers/scientists before submission.

Response: We really apologized for that and thank you very much for your kind consideration. We carefully checked and corrected the English writing with the help of native English scientist.