

Dear editor,

we sincerely appreciate your decision that our manuscript could be reconsidered for publication in the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery. We performed the revision of the manuscript, made some changes and additions in the text according to the recommendations of the *Science editor*, since both Reviewers did not send any recommendations. Our responses to the comments are presented below.

Science editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a retrospective study of the patients with necrotizing pancreatitis by the time of operative pancreatic debridement. The topic is within the scope of the WJH. (1) Classification: Grade C and Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This is a good work. The study thoroughly described the pathophysiology of ANP and correlated with the main objective of the study, methodology well defined covering all aspects and statistical analysis explained in detail. The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented with correct use of grammar and language; (3) Format: There are 5 tables and 2 figures; (4) References: A total of 30 references are cited, including 14 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There are no self-citations; and (6) References recommendations: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially references published by the peer reviewer(s) him/herself (themselves). If the authors find the peer reviewer(s) request for the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself (themselves), please send the peer reviewer's ID number to editorialoffice@wjgnet.com. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A and Grade B. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, the signed informed consent, and the Institutional Review Board Approval Form. The authors should provide the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJH. 5 Issues raised: (1) The title is too long, and it should be no more than 18 words; (2) The "Author Contributions" section is missing. Please provide the author contributions; and (3) 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. 6 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

Comments

Dear Editor, thank you very much for the positive respond to our manuscript. We appreciate your valuable remarks and comments that helped us to improve the manuscript. We have made necessary changes in the text according to the "Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision: Retrospective Study" and the "Format for Manuscript Revision: Retrospective Study" downloaded from your website.

In original manuscript, there was two references under the number "14", that was our mistake we apologies for. The total number of references is 31.

We provide the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement.

We changed the title so that it is no more than 18 words now.

We added the "Author Contributions" section in manuscript.

We also provide the original figure documents, that were prepared and arranged using PowerPoint. The figure 2 was prepared by using SPSS software, so that figures can not be reprocessed in PowerPoint, but we additionally enlarged the legends on figures to rise their quality.

We hope that these revisions improve the paper.