R1

The present study is an interesting systematic review about the image characteristics in patients with Groove pancreatitis. The topic is interesting and the existing data are scarce, so I consider can be published. In general is a good study that can be helpful for clinicians. However two main concerns arise:

Evaluation of bias of the included studies was not showed and is imperative

We have performed and added bias evaluation according to the Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale for Cohort Studies (table 2).

The limitations and strengths of the study must be mentioned.

We have added a dedicated paragraph in the discussion.

R2

This is a clinically important a systematic Review investigating imaging of paraduodenal pancreatitis (PP). However, there are several issues in this paper that need to be reconsidered.

Major 1. Distinguishing between PP and pancreatic cancer remains challenging in clinical setting. Thus, the features of PP should be contrasted with those of pancreatic cancer. The authors focus on four articles explored imaging accuracy in differential diagnosis between PP and pancreatic cancer. However, this systematic review only enumerated those results and did not provide a cross-cutting interpretation. Please assess which imaging should be used in the differential diagnosis of PP and pancreatic cancer.

We have modified the conclusions chapter and better explained the role of the different imaging modalities.

2. The author states in the Introduction section that PP has been subdivided into cystic or solid type; however, there was no mention of cystic and solid types in the results section. Please consider dividing PP into cystic type and solid type.

We have added a paragraph regarding cystic and solid subtypes in the discussion.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The "statistical analysis" section is incomplete. For example, there is not even mentioned

how was the assessment of heterogeneity

Given the descriptive aim of our work, heterogeneity was not statistically assessed. Clinical

heterogeneity of the included studies is included in table 1, column 4 (AIM).

2. In the text are mentioned few tables that I cannot see in any place

We apologize for the missing tables (we have been a technical problem with the upload), we have
added them to the text.

3. The evaluation of bias is only mentioned but I do not see

The evaluation has been added (Table 2).