

AUTHORS' RESPONSE LETTER

Reviewer #1:

The paper by Ko et al. titled: "Pancreatic enzymes and abdominal adipose tissue distribution in new-onset diabetes after acute pancreatitis" is an important study looking at individual with NODAP in comparison to those with T2DM and healthy controls with respect to fat phenotypes and levels of various pancreatic enzymes. The authors show that only individuals with NODAP were characterized by significant inverse associations between two abdominal fat phenotypes (intrapancreatic fat and visceral fat) and circulating levels of pancreatic amylase. Overall, it is a well-designed and reported study. The following, mainly minor corrections should be made before the paper is accepted for publication.

- **P values in first sentence of the results section in the abstract; Are these p values with respect to NODAP only or for both NODAP and T2DM in comparison with controls?**

Response: We thank the reviewer for their careful review of our work and apologize for the confusion. The p values for intra-pancreatic fat deposition and visceral fat were derived from ANOVA that compared the mean differences between the three study groups.

- **Brackets in second sentence of the introduction can be removed and punctuation used to ease reading**

Response: Thank you. The sentence has been amended, as suggested.

- **Very long sentence before the last paragraph of the introduction should be split in two. Sentence begins with Further, given that individuals with metabolic disorders (including type 2 diabetes and obesity) of....**

Response: Thank you. We have amended the text, as suggested.

- **Under study design, the institution and country where the ethics committee belongs must be stated**

Response: Thank you. The requested details have been provided in the revised manuscript.

- **Type 2 prediabetes or diabetes (T2DM). The word mellitus was missing in some instances. Please rectify**

Response: Thank you. The requested changes have been made.

- **Include a space between numbers and units of measurement**

Response: Thank you. The requested changes have been made.

- **The authors say the control group included healthy volunteers were 1:1 matched on sex. Why were they not also age matched seeing that aging can affect metabolic function? How was this adjusted for?**

Response: Given the relatively small sample size of the present study, it was feasible to match only on one variable in our study population. We believe that sex is more important than age when it comes to body fat distribution and, therefore, matched the groups on the former. Having said that, age is certainly a non-negligible covariate. That is why we included age in all the adjusted statistical models (i.e., models 2, 3, and 4).

- **It is not clear who did the imaging and analysis. Was the person doing the blinded as per type of diabetes/patient or to study? If so specify, if not, how was any bias as a result of this avoided?**

Response: The measurements of intra-pancreatic fat, skeletal muscle fat, visceral fat, subcutaneous fat were done independently by two observers. Liver fat was measured by single observer. The observers were unaware of group allocation. This has been clarified in the revised manuscript.

- **In the sentence “The active forms of pancreatic lipase and chymotrypsin were measured using sandwich ELISA” include “a” between sandwich and ELISA**

Response: Thank you. This has been addressed.

- **In the results of Associations between abdominal fat phenotypes and enzyme concentrations in the study groups, proper referencing to figures is not made in the some cases and in Figure 1. It is difficult to tell which group of patients are represented by A-H. Specify this in the text and on the figure to ease readability**

Response: Thank you for your thoughtful comment. We have elected to split the original figure 1 into three figures (one figure for each of the studied pancreatic enzymes) with a view to improving readability. We have properly referred to the new figures in the revised manuscript.

- **Very difficult to read font in Figure 1 against the graphs. Perhaps made the page landscape to have space to increase size.**

Response: The requested changes have been made.

- **In the table, significant p values are supposed to be bold. This is not the case.**

Response: Thank you. All the statistically significant values (p less than 0.05) have been bolded in the revised manuscript.

- **The authors should include page numbers.**

Response: Thank you. Page numbers have been included.

Science editor:

The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered;

Response: We have done our best to address the reviewer's comments.

Self-cited references: There are 19 self-cited references. The self-referencing rates should be less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations (i.e. those that are most closely related to the topic of the manuscript) and remove

all other improper self-citations. If the authors fail to address the critical issue of self-citation, the editing process of this manuscript will be terminated;

Response: The revised manuscript contains only 5 references from our group.

5 Issues raised: (1) The “Author Contributions” section is missing. Please provide the author contributions;

Response: This information has been added.

(2) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor;

Response: This has been done.

(3) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout;

Response: This has been done.

(4) The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text;

Response: This has been done.

and (5) Please add the all authors to the author list in the F6Publishing system, with their emails and ORCIDs.

Response: This has been done.

Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, and the manuscript is

conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Response: Thanks very much for the positive decision.