

Dear Editor,

On behalf of all co-authors of the manuscript titled “The Last Decade 2008-2018: Mortality Assessment for Pancreas Transplants in the United States”, I thank you for considering it for acceptance after a full review.

We also appreciate the feedback provided by the reviewers and we addressed all the suggestions provided.

Reviewer #1:

Specific Comments to Authors: This needs language editing. This looks like a report. A written version of a different language style would be acceptable.

Answer: The manuscript was sent to the office of research and grant writing at our institution. The manuscript was re-written to the standard requested by the reviewer

Reviewer #2:

Specific Comments to Authors: Major Comments: 1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript.

Answer: we added to the manuscript and highlighted the current status of pancreas transplant in terms of significant decline in the number of patients receiving transplant since 2004 despite the persistence incidence of diabetes.

2. The results and discussion section is very weak and no emphasis is given on the discussion of the results like why certain effects are coming in to existence and what could be the possible reason behind them?

Answer: The study team re-wrote the discussion to address the concerns and the important points mentioned by the reviewer

3. Conclusion: not properly written

Answer: conclusion was re-written

4. Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results. 5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature. 6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I

found so many typos throughout the manuscript. 7. English is modest. Therefore, the authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.

Answers to above points: All concerns were addressed by re writing the results and discussion in the way it was suggested. The manuscript was reviewed by the office of grant and research writing at our institution to correct the language

Thank you,

Tambi Jarmi