

Dear editors,

Thank you very much for offering us an opportunity to resubmit our manuscript after reversing. We have made extensive revisions according to the reviewers' comments. I hope you can give us another opportunity to further revise our manuscript if some limitations remain in the manuscript.

Looking forward to hearing from you,

Best regards,

Ningli Chai

Round 1

Replies to Reviewer #1: Thank you very much for your positive comments, which might be of great help to improve the quality of our manuscript.

1. Minor editing and language corrections are needed.

Reply:

Thanks for your constructive suggestions. Based on your suggestion, we have re-edited our article with the help of a native speaker.

2. The title consists of 19 words. However, the maximum number of words allowed by the journal is 18. I suggest the following title: "Interventional radiology followed by endoscopic drainage for pancreatic fluid collections associated with high bleeding risk: Two cases report".

Reply:

Thanks for your kind comment. We completely agreed your proposal and

revised the title to "Interventional radiology followed by endoscopic drainage for pancreatic fluid collections associated with high bleeding risk: Two cases report".

3-9. 3. Abstract: The ages of the patients should be mentioned. **4. Please add another word to be 6 keywords as per journal style.** **5. Core tip:** a. It is better to replace the "gastro" with the "stomach". Please do the same change throughout the manuscript. b. Last line: I think it is better to add "in patients" before "with". **6. Introduction** a. Please add the full term of the abbreviation (ESEG). b. This sentence "In two patients, lumen-metal apposing stents were successfully placed to drain PFCs under endoscopic ultrasound guidance during preoperative embolization of potential bleeding vessels." is confusing because this sentence does belong to your work or the work of other authors. Please clarify it. **7. Case presentation:** We found that there is a mixing of the information about the diagnosis, treatment, and follow-up. Therefore, they need re-writing. **8. Discussion:** last paragraph a. You mentioned only one limitation of the study while you said some limitations. Besides, a reference for it is necessary. **9. References:** you missed adding the PMID and DOI in reference number 14.

Reply:

Thank you very much for your positive and constructive comments and suggestions. Based on your above comments, the article has already been carefully reviewed again and modified using Microsoft Word Track Changes.

10. Figures. a. **Figure 1:** "perioperative" needs to be changed to "preoperative". b. **Figure 2:** 1. This belongs to which patient. 2. You must add the EUS picture of the other patient. 3. Please remove the "OLYMPUS" from the picture. 4. Please add the word "white" before the word "arrow". c. **Figure 3** 1. This belongs to which patient. 2. You must add the angiogram

picture of the other patient.

Reply:

The word "perioperative" has been changed to "preoperative" in Figure 1. The pictures of the other patient have been added to the Figure 2 and 3, and the subtle errors in pictures have been revised.

Replies to Reviewer #2: First of all, thank you very much for your positive and constructive comments and suggestions.

1. Specific suggestions below: Case Summary -“Gastro varices” should be “Gastric varices”. Introduction -ESEG is not introduced in full before abbreviating -“low invasiveness” could be reworded to read more easily.

Reply:

The mistakes you mentioned have been modified in the article and the word “low invasiveness” has been changed to “minimal invasiveness”.

2. Case Report: The sections of Chief complaints, History of present illness, History of past illness, Personal and family history, Physical examination, Laboratory examinations, Imaging examinations, and Treatment all present the two patients in parallel. Most limited case series are presented with each case presented in its entirety, in series, one after the other.

Reply:

Based on your comments, we have read more case series in this journal to improve the structure of our article. The Case Report of the manuscript has been re-edited according to your constructive suggestion.

3. Outcome and Follow-Up -“mo” should be should be spelled out.

Reply:

The word “mo” has been changed to “month”.

4. Discussion -is there a better word than “disturbing” in paragraph 2? - “Endovascular therapy” or “endovascular embolization” may be better terms

than “interventional radiology” in paragraph 3. Conclusion -As in the discussion, “endovascular therapy” or “endovascular embolization” may be better terms than “interventional radiology.”

Reply:

Based on your suggestions, “disturbing” and “interventional radiology” has been revised to “haunt” and “endovascular embolization” respectively.

Replies to Reviewer #3: Thank you very much for your affirmation of the article and your efforts in improving the quality of manuscript.

1. However, as I have done the work (provided in yellow & red highlight), authors please seriously concede to the recommendations provided regarding grammatical errors. I have also made a suggestion in the latter part of the concluding sentence in the conclusion section. Finally, please use the appropriate check list PDF version accordingly and resubmit. The appropriate form is available on the following website [<https://www.care-statement.org/downloads>]. Provided that authors follow these recommendations explicitly, I recommend that this manuscript is worthy of and should be fully considered for publication.

Reply:

Thanks again for your efforts in improving the grammar of the manuscript. We all conceded the great recommendations you provided. Furthermore, the updated check list PDF version has been resubmitted.

Replies to Reviewer #4: Thank you very much for your positive comments, which might be of great help to improve the quality of our manuscript.

1. 1) Abstract (Background): Instead of "puncture points next to multiple vessels" I would substitute with "intervening vessels". **2) Abstract (Case Summary):** Instead of "gastro" would put "gastric". **3) EUS** just needs to be abbreviated once in the abstract. **4) Abstract (Case Summary):** Interventional "with embolization" was recommended.... Would add the words in quotations. **5) Abstract (Core tip):** "is" should be substituted for "has". The second sentence additionally needs to be rewritten. **6) Introduction:** ESEG needs to be written out prior to abbreviating. These are just several examples of errors found in the abstract and beginning of the intro.

Reply:

Thank you for thoroughly reviewing our article and supplying great advice about the grammatical errors. We have accepted your suggestion and have carefully reviewed the whole essay again to find other remaining grammatical errors. In addition, the manuscript has been modified by a native speaker.

Round 2

Dear Authors, Thank you for revising this article entitled "Interventional radiology followed by endoscopic drainage for pancreatic fluid collections associated with high bleeding risk: Two cases report" for possible publication in the esteemed journal "World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery". You made the required changes. I have only one comment; you must add the CT scan findings in the legend of the Figure 1 to be withstand alone. Congratulations for your nice job.

Reply:

Dear editor, Thanks for offering us an opportunity to resubmit our manuscript after reversing. We have made extensive revisions according to the reviewers' comments.