

Answering Reviewers

1. Is there a reason why the authors did not use other statistical methods, e.g. logistic regression in order to test the hypothesis?

To test a single factor's impact on binary outcome, Pearson's Chi Square Test is sufficient. That was the case in this study.

2. Calculation odds ratios for different CP groups would be a nice addition to this work

Odds ratios for different CP groups has been calculated and added as Table 2A which is found on page 14. Lines 101-103 and 117-120 mention this.

3. I suggest that you include page and line numbering in order to facilitate the review

Page and line numbering have been added to the manuscript.

4. P-value 0.039 should be written as $p=0.039$ and the significance level of 0.05 is already mentioned in the methods section, therefore it and be omitted when presenting individual p-values.

Manuscript has been updated to reflect this suggestion.

5. Please rephrase "diagnosis-only" ERCP to diagnostic ERCP

Manuscript has been updated to reflect this suggestion.

6. I suggest that the discussion section is shortened. Start with the most important findings, compare with other recent publications, and discuss pros and cons of the study design.

The Discussion section has been shortened. It has also been adjusted to start with the most important findings, followed by a comparison with other publications and finally an explanation of limitations of the study.

7. There are too many tables, several tables can be merged into one (tables 4-10, by transposing the rows and columns).

Previous Tables 4-10 have been merged into the new Table 4. Previous Tables 8 and 10 have been merged into table 5. Overall, there are less tables now as compared to the first draft of the manuscript.

8. In table 1, percentages presented under complications are misleading. I suggest calculating percentages based on all the patients in the group, not only those experiencing adverse events.

The p-value showing in Table 1 is corresponding to the percentages of subgroups.

9. The “Author Contributions” section is missing. Please provide the author contributions.

“Author Contributions” section has been added and found in line 39.

10. 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.

Figure 1 will be provided in a PowerPoint document titled “62703-Figure” which can be reprocessed by the editor.

11. PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout.

PMID and DOI numbers have been included for every reference in the reference list. All authors for each reference have also been included.

12. The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text.

“Article Highlights” section has been added at the end of the main text and can be found in lines 222-224.

13. Authors should always cite references that are relevant to their study. Please check and remove any references that are not relevant to this study.

All of the references were relevant to this study and are cited within the text.