

Reviewers Comments:	Responses
<p>This systematic review is well-organized, informative and updated. However, some minor points should be addressed. For example, using "immunity against" in "On the contrary, PEP is less likely to occur in patients with chronic pancreatitis indicating some immunity against PEP, probably because of atrophy and decreased enzymatic activity" (In the section of Assessment of Patient Related Factors) is misleading. It would be better to say that "On the contrary, PEP is less likely to occur in patients with chronic pancreatitis indicating a partial loss of sensitivity to PEP stimulation, probably because of atrophy and decreased enzymatic activity".</p>	<p>We are very grateful for your review of our manuscript and your invaluable feedback. We have corrected the sentences in section of Assessment of Patient Related Factors.</p>
<p>An interesting review</p>	<p>We are grateful for your review.</p>
<p>Please control the English spelling. It is a long paper with many data, not always completely clear: they could be summarized, mainly in the part concerning pharmacological prevention. Similarly , the actual more evident prophylactic and therapeutic measures can be underlined.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for your review. English spelling was checked by a native speaker. Prophylactic and therapeutic measures were underlined in the discussion section.</p>

This systematic review provided comprehensive overview of the prevention strategy for post ERCP pancreatitis. However, since this is a systematic review and there are numerous studies being identified in the literature, which is sufficient for meta-analysis. for example, there are multiple studies on the use of indomethacin for prevention; why not perform meta-analysis to get a pooled effect? also through quantitative analysis, the publication bias and heterogeneity can be quantitatively analyzed; and the result can also provide precision of the estimates. such a result will give rise to the assessment of the quality of the evidence. In the GRADE framework, heterogeneity, imprecision, and risk of bias are all factors that can affect the quality of evidence. For a systematic review aiming to provide recommendations, the quality of evidence should be carefully assessed. Current study is more like a narrative review without transparent analysis of the available evidence.

We are very grateful for your meticulous review of our manuscript. This article was written as a systematic review upon the invitation from the journal. Structure of our article was designed as a systematic review which had the fundamental frame of other systematic reviews in WJG. Converting the article to a meta-analysis means rewriting the article again beginning from the “materials and methods” section. Given the nature of the systematic review, comparison of the evidences for each of prevention categories were assessed through outputs of the existing studies, as conducted in other reviews in the literature. Comments of the reviewer can be regarded as crucial guiding for the further studies. Therefore, these comments were added in the discussion section.