

Response to Reviewer Comments

To the Editor and Reviewer,

We appreciate the time and effort taken by the reviewer to assess our submission and provide feedback. We have edited the paper to address the concerns raised by the reviewer with our responses listed as follows:

1. *In the methods and materials, the authors stated that 77 procedures (63 ERCP, 14 EUS-guided FNA/FNB/liver biopsies) performed on 36 patients were included. The information is not consistent with that described in the Table 1.*

Our study treated each procedure as a unique individual despite having the same patients undergoing multiple procedures because each procedure was an isolated event with variations in lab values and clinical status even among the same patients. The following section has been added to the paper to clarify this approach: **Of note, each case was treated as a unique individual for the purposes of our study given that each procedure was an isolated event with differences in lab values and clinical status even among the same patient.**

Please let us know if further clarification is required or if there are other concerns with this approach.

2. *5 cases were associated with death within 30 days of the procedure date, what were the causes of the death?*

4 of the cases were associated with death secondary to progression of an underlying malignancy. 1 of the cases was associated with death from septic shock secondary to an intrabdominal infection in setting of advanced cholangiocarcinoma. None of the deaths were deemed to be secondary to the ERCP/EUS procedure. The following section has been added to the paper to clarify the cause of death: **5 cases were associated with death within 30 days of the procedure date; however, none of the deaths were determined to be secondary to the procedure itself, with 4 of the deaths attributable to progression of previously known cancer and 1 case being associated with septic shock secondary to intraabdominal infection in the setting of cholangiocarcinoma.**

Again, we thank our reviewer for taking the time to edit our paper. Please let us know if further clarification of our responses is required.

Sincerely,

Timothy Yoo