

Reviewer #1:

The paper represents an example of good research, including the study of both clinical and experimental materials. The title adequately reflects the main theme of the manuscript. The abstract is written competently and clearly summarizes the work done. The background information is satisfactory and contains fairly brief but sufficient information. Methods and materials are selected very precisely and carefully. Methods representing different areas of biomedicine collectively provide good tools for carrying out planned research. The results achieved are interesting and make a good contribution to the field. They should be of particular interest and importance to researchers involved in pancreaticobiliary disorders and experimental modeling. The tables are clean. The figures are very good. The manuscript complies with the requirements for the use of SI units. The list of provided literature is sufficient, given that the number of articles devoted to the problem under study is not very large. Because the study involves both humans and animals, the authors provide two ethically approved protocols.

Response: Dear reviewer, thanks for your appreciation on our manuscript.

Reviewer #2:

This manuscript is well and good at innovation and clears the clarity of the reader. It is well structured and well written. The author does a good job of presenting a highly technical and complicated process in an easy-to-understand manner. Authors need to cross check the reference section by addressing the cited contents in the introduction and related work part. The introduction must be an extended version of the abstract. The authors must elaborate on the points highlighted on the abstract and give supportive ideas and references. The conclusions in this manuscript are primitive. Rewrite your conclusions. References aren't formatted according to rules. Additional References: The following articles could be useful: • Exploring New Horizons: Surgical Robots Supported by Artificial Intelligence. <https://doi.org/10.58496/MJAIH/2023/008>

Question 1: Authors need to cross check the reference section by addressing the cited contents in the introduction and related work part.

Response: Dear reviewer, we have checked the references and rewritten part of the introduction. We have highlighted the revised/added contents with yellow color in the revised manuscript.

Question 2: The introduction must be an extended version of the abstract. The authors must elaborate on the points highlighted on the abstract and give supportive ideas and references.

Response: Dear reviewer, we have rewritten and extended the introduction. Due to the lack of literature related to the animal model of choledochal cysts, we were unable to find new references.

Question 3: The conclusions in this manuscript are primitive. Rewrite your conclusions.

Response: Dear reviewer, we have rewritten the conclusions. The revised contents were

highlighted with yellow color.

Question 4: References aren't formatted according to rules. Additional References: The following articles could be useful:

- Exploring New Horizons: Surgical Robots Supported by Artificial Intelligence. <https://doi.org/10.58496/MJAIH/2023/008>

Response: We have revised the format of the references.

Editorial Office's Comments:

(1) Please provide the filled conflict-of-interest disclosure form.

Response: We have provided the filled conflict-of-interest disclosure form.

(2) Please provide the Figures cited in the original manuscript in the form of PPT. All text can be edited, including A, B, arrows, etc. With respect to the reference to the Figure, please verify if it is an original image created for the manuscript, if not, please provide the source of the picture and the proof that the Figure has been authorized by the previous publisher or copyright owner to allow it to be redistributed. All legends are incorrectly formatted and require a general title and explanation for each figure. Such as Figure 1 title. A: ; B: ; C: .

Response: We have provided the Figures cited in the original manuscript in the form of PPT and revised the all legends.

(3) Please provide all fund documents [the Key R&D Program of Zhejiang (2023C03029); Clinical study on minimally invasive diagnosis and treatment of abdominal organs in Zhejiang Province (01492-02); Health Science and Technology Plan of Zhejiang Province (2022RC201); Zhejiang Provincial Natural Science Foundation Project (LY20H030007)].

Response: We have provided all fund documents. However, we could not find the original documents for this project (Clinical study on minimally invasive diagnosis and treatment of abdominal organs in Zhejiang Province (01492-02), so we deleted it in the manuscript.

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

Response: We have added the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text.

(5) Please provide the primary version (PDF) of the Institutional Review Board's official approval, prepared in the official language of the authors' country.

Response: We have provided the primary version (PDF) of the Institutional Review Board's official approval.

(6) Please provide the primary version (PDF) of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee's official approval in the official language of the authors' country.

Response: We have provided the primary version (PDF) of the Institutional Animal

Care and Use Committee's official approval.

(7) Please provide the ARRIVE Guidelines.

Response: We have provided the ARRIVE Guidelines.

(8) Please provide the Biostatistics Review Certificate.

Response: We have provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate.