

Response to reviewers

Review #1: 03666697

This study reports the role of pancreatography in the endoscopic management of encapsulated pancreatic collections. This is a well-written manuscript. The newly proposed classification of encapsulated pancreatic collections based on pancreatography is clinically practical. However, there are two minor mistakes in the manuscript: 1. In Figure 4, there is no figure legend for Type IV pancreatography (1) 2. Page 38, NEW CLASSIFICATION PROPOSITION Type IV should alert for the possibility of DPSP and an image study - such as CT or MRI - must be performed to evaluate the pancreatic tissue beyond the disruption. If DPSP is confirmed,..... Should these two underlined words be changed to DPDS (2)?

Dear reviewer, we would like to thank you for the time spent reviewing our manuscript and for the observations made. We resolved the issues pointed as suggested:

- (1) We have now included a detailed description of Type IV pancreatography as recommended.
- (2) We have also altered the text as suggested to improve readability and make the manuscript more clear overall.

We hope that we have resolve the two issues you pointed, improving our manuscript. Thank you for your time and suggestions.

Review #2: 05382551

In this article, the authors review the role of pancreatography in the endoscopic treatment of encapsulated pancreatic collections and propose a new classification system to aid in proper endoscopic evaluation and treatment. This work describes an interesting issue and agreed with the scope of the journal. However, it would need to be organized and structured differently. There are some sections that describe the state of the art: Indication, Time, Study Modality, Descriptors, Classifications, Approach to pancreatography findings. These sections must be merged into a single "Background" section (1). In the "Methods" section, the method followed to carry out the literature review should be explained in more detail (2). After the "New Classification proposition" section a new "Discussion" section should be added. In this new section it should be argued that the proposal that is made contributes over other existing proposals (3). It would be interesting, for example, to use a comparative table to compare the proposal with other alternatives (4). The conclusions should be rewritten to better reflect the work done (5). Finally, in the introduction, a paragraph should be added explaining the structure that the article will have and the content that will be described in each section (6).

Dear reviewer, we would like to thank you for the time spent reviewing our manuscript and for your suggestions. We reviewed and answer point-by-point all suggestions you made:

- (1) We have changed the structure of our manuscript as suggested: Introduction, Methods, Background, New classification proposition, Discussion and Conclusion. We believe this has significantly improved the readability of the manuscript to reach a larger audience.
- (2) We have strengthen the methods section to include a detailed explanation of the literature review performed.
- (3) We have added a Discussion section comparing our classification with previous ones within the current literature. In doing so, we have

highlighted the advantages of this new proposed and simplified classification system.

- (4) Per the reviewer's suggestion, we have added a new table comparing all previous classification and our proposed one regarding the crucial points about pancreatography in the context of EPCs (table 3).
- (5) We have amended our conclusion to better highlight the work done regarding the role of endoscopic management and work done towards creating this new classification system - including the potential generalizability of our system.
- (6) We have now included a paragraph explaining the structure of the article and the contents described within each section.

Once more we thank you for your time and for all your suggestions that have certainly improved the quality of our manuscript. We hope that we have resolved all issues pointed and covered all suggestions. We hope that your new analysis is positive after the changes and improvements made. We look forward to your response, and we are available for any further questions.