

Dear Dr. Liu Ji-Hong

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to submit a revised draft of my manuscript titled [Removal of Intrahepatic Bile Duct Stone Could Reduce the Risk of Cholangiocarcinoma: A Single-Center Retrospective Study in South Korea] to World Journal of Clinical Cases.

I appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers have dedicated to providing your valuable feedback on my manuscript. We are grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments on my paper. I have been able to incorporate changes to reflect most of the suggestions provided by the reviewers. I have highlighted the changes within the manuscript.

Here is a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments and concerns.

Comments from Reviewer 1

Comment 1: [***although the authors correctly included important papers in this setting, we believe the evolving systemic treatment scenario for cholangiocarcinoma should be further discussed and some recently published papers added within the introduction (PMID: 33756174 ; PMID: 35031442 ; PMID: 35977458 ; PMID: 33592561), only for a matter of consistency***]

Response: Thank you for pointing this out. I agree with this comment. Therefore, I added more comments about that in introduction.

Comment 2: [***the authors should expand the Discussion section, including a more personal perspective to reflect on. For example, they could answer the following questions – in order to facilitate the understanding of this complex topic to readers: what potential does this study hold? What are the knowledge gaps and how do researchers tackle them? How do you see this area unfolding in the next 5 years? We think it would be extremely interesting for the readers. However, we think the authors should be acknowledged for their work. In fact, they correctly addressed an important topic, the methods sound good and their discussion is well balanced. One additional little flaw: the authors could better explain the limitations of their work, in the last part of the Discussion. We believe this article is suitable for publication in the journal although some revisions are needed. The main strengths of this paper are that it addresses an interesting and very timely question and provides a clear answer, with some limitations. We suggest a linguistic revision and the addition of some references for a matter of consistency. Moreover, the authors should better clarify some points.***]

Response: Agree. I have, accordingly, revised the manuscript in discussion section about this point.