

Dear editors and reviewers

Thank you very much for your kind peer review.

We would like to address and answer to all the comments and suggestions from all the reviewers as far as possible and resubmit the corrected manuscript.

Reviewer#1

Comments:

The authors provide a review on the use of bile duct substitutes for the treatment of bile duct lesions. This is a promising area of research, and is of scientific interest. The review is very complete, but writing in the English language needs to be revised. Some issues that must be addressed: 1- In the first line of the abstract, "biliodigestive anastomosis" instead of "reconstruction of anastomosis" would better convey the meaning of the sentence; 2 - In the abstract, "bioabsorbable material" is listed twice among the types of BDS; 3- On page 3 line 12, "However" instead of "however"; 4- On page 3 line 17, "are considered high-risk factors". In the conclusion section, the authors could mention what type of bioabsorbable materials show promise as potential BDS, and what are the perspectives for other types of BDS (such as autologous tissue).

Some issues that must be addressed:

1- In the first line of the abstract, "biliodigestive anastomosis" instead of "reconstruction of anastomosis" would better convey the meaning of the sentence.

As you have suggested, we have changed 「reconstruction of anastomosis」 to

「bilio digestive anastomosis」 .

2 - In the abstract, "bioabsorbable material" is listed twice among the types of BDS;

As you have suggested, we have changed 「bioabsorbable material」 to 「non-bioabsorbable material」 .

3- On page 3 line 12, "However" instead of "however"

As you have suggested, we have changed 「however」 to 「However」 .

4- On page 3 line 17, "are considered high-risk factors".

As you have suggested, we have changed 「high-risk factor」 to 「high-risk factors」.

In the conclusion section, the authors could mention what type of bioabsorbable materials show promise as potential BDS, and what are the perspectives for other types of BDS (such as autologous tissue).

Thank you very much for your instructions.

Since this paper is a "narrative review" and no definitive results for bile duct substitutes have been derived, the conclusion is the same as before proofreading.

Reviewer#2

Comments:

The review is suitable for clinical practice. The authors read a large amount of relevant literature, and have a very profound understanding of the biliary tract injury. However, the authors did not propound specific and constructive opinion to resolve the problem (biliary strictures , the bile plug)

Thank you very much for your kind peer review. I think the problem of biliary strictures and biliary plugs is an important one, as you have reviewed. However,

since this paper is a review of bile duct substitutes, that part was not examined in detail.

Reviewer#3

Comments: Well written paper. Interesting topic.

Thank you very much for your kind peer review. Thank you for your interest in our paper.

I would once again like to thank for your valuable comments and suggestions.

Revision reviewer

Comments: The corrected manuscript is clearly written and of scientific value, and I have no further observations. I congratulate the authors on this interesting work.

Thank you very much for your kind revision review.

Mitsuo Miyazawa MD, PhD, FACS

Teikyo University, School of medicine, Mizonokuchi Hospital

Department of Surgery