Reviewer's comment:

1 Peer-review report

Reviewer #1: Dear authors, This is a brief review and brings key points about COVID-19 infected pancreatitis, differences between pancreatitis and COVID-19 infected pancreatitis, impact of COVID-19 on the management of pancreatitis, and surgical intervention for pancreatitis in the era of COVID-19.
Some points that can be improved in this review:

The abstract does not present the main points listed in this review.
There is no need to add the data analyses found in the studies.
The abstract needs to be revised by the authors;
A: We have revised the abstract to meet the content.

A new topic listing only the **surgical complications** should be inserted;
A: we have added a paragraph about surgical complications in the discussion.

The topic "COVID-19 Infection-Related Pancreatitis, Mechanism" is too short and should be improved by the authors.
A: We have added information to it.

A deeper insight into the mechanisms by which they lead to pancreatitis should be provided;
Finally, this brief review aims to focus on surgical interventions and this point was rarely raised throughout the review.

Reviewer #2:
1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes
2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes
3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes
4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes
5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? NA
6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field?

NA

7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes

8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? NA

9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? NA 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? NA

11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Yes

12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes

13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? NA

14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? NA

Accept after minor language and text editing.

A: Thanks for appreciating.

2 Editorial Office's comments

1) Science Editor: The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it' s ready for the first decision.
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

2) Company Editor-in-Chief: I recommend the manuscript to be published in the World Journal of Clinical Cases. **Before final acceptance, the author(s) must add a table/figure (medical imaging) to the manuscript.** There are no restrictions on the figures (color, B/W). Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and **improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge** research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the Reference Citation Analysis (RCA). RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/.

A: We have placed Table.1 in the text. Thanks. In RCA searching, there is not much information about this issue.