

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade A (Priority publishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (High priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** the article was prepared in accordance with the quality and criteria of the journal.

Response: Thanks!

Reviewer #2:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** In the discussion section the authors should comment in relation to their findings about the use of endoscopic ultrasonography, elastography and CE-EUS in differentiating focal lesions of the pancreas, in order to avoid invasive procedures including surgical resection of the pancreas. Moreover, EUS-FNA or EUS-TCB could provide pathological specimens useful in the differential diagnosis of these lesions.

Response: As suggested, we had added the following paragraph in the discussion section. "Current diagnostic methods available for the differentiation of pancreatic lesions are various, among which contrast-enhanced ultrasonography (CE-US), endoscopic ultrasonography (EUS) , contrast-enhanced computed tomography (CE-CT), contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging, contrast-enhanced elastography, endoscopic ultrasonography fine-needle aspiration (EUS-FNA), and contrast-enhanced endoscopic ultrasonography (CE-EUS) are widely used in recent years. As one of the current gold standards for diagnosis of pancreatic neoplasms, EUS-FNA with 100% specificity correctly can access the pathological diagnosis directly. In addition, an accurate tissue diagnosis based on a EUS-FNA biopsy specimen may render surgery for those benign neoplasms or indolent cancer unnecessary. However, which method is better for pancreatic mass diagnosis remains unclear.[24]"

24 Mei S WM, Sun L. . Contrast-Enhanced EUS for Differential Diagnosis of Pancreatic Masses: A Meta-Analysis. . *Gastroenterol Res Pract* 2019; **2019:1670183** [PMID: 30962802 DOI: 10.1155/2019/1670183]

**Science editor:** Issues raised:

(1) The authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s);

Response: As suggested, we had uploaded the approved grant application form.

(2) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor;

Response: As suggested, we had uploaded the original pictures using PowerPoint.

(3) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout;

Response: As suggested, we had added PMID and DOI numbers.

(4) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text;

Response: As suggested, we had added "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text.

and (5) Authors should always cite references that are relevant to their study. Please check and remove any references that not relevant to this study. 6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Response: As suggested, we had removed some cite references, and now the total number of references is 34.