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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This study investigated the relationship between Type 2 autoimmune pancreatitis and severe ulcerative colitis in clinical field, utilizing a case series and solid data. Such study is interesting and meaningful, which might provide theoretical basis for clinical treatments of Type 2 autoimmune pancreatitis and severe ulcerative colitis. The present article can be accepted and published.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The Authors here presented three cases of suspected type 2 AIP in patients with severe ulcerative colitis. The paper is well-written, synthetic, and fluent. An algorithm for diagnosing type 2 AIP in IBD patients was proposed. However, Authors should give some clarifications about the diagnosing process in all the three suspected cases. 1) Case 1 and Case 2: a diagnosis of “Probable type 2 AIP” was proposed, following 2011 ICDC criteria. Authors considered suggestive imaging + IBD diagnosis + response to steroid trial. However, the ICDC’s steroid trial should be carefully conducted after negative complete workup for cancer (including biopsy) and consists in a “Rapid (=<2 wk) radiologically demonstrable resolution or marked improvement in manifestations”. In these cases, patients underwent steroid treatment for 8 weeks, which is way more than what the Guideline suggest. Then, in case 1 an FDG-PET and not a CT or MRI was performed after the trial in order to assess the improvement of the pancreatic inflammation, while in case 2 there’s no mention of imaging repetition after the trial. Case 3: a diagnosis of “Definitive type 2 AIP” was proposed, following 2011 ICDC criteria. Authors considered suggestive imaging + IBD diagnosis + level 2 histology criteria + response to steroid trial. Again, steroid treatment lasted 8 weeks, there wasn’t any repeated imaging test after the trial, and it was not repeated at the time of recurrence. 2) Has CA19.9 been tested in case 1 and case 3? And why hasn’t it been re-evaluated (in all three cases) after 2 weeks of steroid trial, as suggested by the Guideline? 3) I would suggest to re-arrange Table 1 to reach higher clarity. Why don’t Authors cite more precisely the ICDC tables 3 and 5? 4) Can Authors provide histologic images of patient 3? Type 2 AIP is a very difficult entity to be diagnosed, but Authors should better discuss
their process and where/why it keeps distance from ICDC.
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I have no further comments and I believe that the amended manuscript can now be accepted for publication.