

Ms. Aafke van Dijk
Academical Medical Center
Room G4-138, Meibergdreef 9
1105 AZ Amsterdam



Academisch Medisch Centrum
Universiteit van Amsterdam

Editorial board of World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery
World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery Editorial Office
7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Amsterdam, October 19th 2019

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find enclosed the revision of our manuscript entitled "Bile leakage after loop closure versus clip closure of the cystic duct during laparoscopic cholecystectomy", which we would like to re-submit for publication in the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery.

Our responses to the comments of the reviewers and editors are attached to the bottom of this letter. This manuscript is of special interest for the readers of the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery and we feel that the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery represents the appropriate platform for publication of this manuscript.

This manuscript has been seen and approved by all authors. The manuscript has not been published before and is not being considered for publication elsewhere. No conflict of interest has been reported by any of the authors.

Thank you for your consideration of the publication of our revised manuscript.

On behalf of all the authors,

Yours sincerely,

Aafke van Dijk

Our response to the reviewers' and the editor comments is as follows:

Editor's comments

We would like to thank the editor for a thorough read and we answered all questions within the revised manuscript. Track changes were used and all changes were highlighted.

1. We revised the duplicated parts according to the CrossCheck report uploaded by the editor
2. We added a running title.
3. Decomposable figures were uploaded, organized in a powerpoint file.
4. We changed the font to Book Antiqua and used 1.5 line spacing.
5. We added the details of every author.
6. A telephone number was added for the corresponding author. A fax number is not available, as we do not use fax.
7. ORCID numbers were added for each author.
8. The contribution of each author to the manuscript was specified.

9. Institutional review board statement was added to the online system.
10. Biostatistics statement was added to the online system.
11. Data for the corresponding author were added.
12. Strobe statement was uploaded tot the online system.
13. The caption 'Aim' was added to the abstract. Also, the purpose of the study was stated using no more than 20 words.
14. Keywords were added to the abstract.
15. A core tip was added.
16. An audio core tip was uploaded in the online electronic system.
17. All authors' names, abbreviations and manuscript title were added below the abstract.
18. The references were superscripted in square brackets at the end of the sentence and to each reference the doi and pmid (if available) was added. There are no repeated references.
19. Article highlights were added.

Reviewer 1

Title: Apt. Abstract: Well written. Gives a brief outline of the article. Introduction: It is well written and gives a good preview of the issue being studied. Materials and methods: Well written. Statistical methods well explained. However the various risk factors need more elaboration. Results: Very well presented. Discussion: Mechanisms of leakage in each of the factors considered need elaboration. Tables and figures: well documented. Conclusion: Useful for practicing surgeons.

Thank you so much for your positive comments. An elaboration on the various risk factors was added to the method section on page 6 and 7. An explanation of the several mechanisms of leakage was added to the discussion, to elaborate as per instruction of the reviewer.