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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Thank you for the opportunity for reviewing this manuscript. I consider the question raised of utmost importance; however, I have concerns regarding the clinical value of the findings. My comments are, as follows: - I understand that the authors tried to increase the statistical power by increasing event number (using MSAP + SAP instead of SAP alone), but the choice of this composite outcome is unlucky, as having MSAP has far not as worse prognosis as having SAP. In my opinion, it would be more relevant to predict the composite of SAP + mortality + fetal death or a something similar outcome. -The definition of CV failure can overestimated the incidence of true CV failure. E.g., need for vasopressor support may be a better option. -An external validation would be desirable. This would increase sample size as well. -A recommend adding negative and positive predictive values as well and set the test either for confirmation of a favorable or for an exclusion of an unfavorable outcome, to increase clinical applicability. -Using labs within 48 hours after admission is a wide range as a lot can change during this period.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The severity of acute pancreatitis in pregnancy (APIP) is a rare condition which is known to be associated with a higher risks of maternal and fetal death. There are few studies that focus on APIP causes, course and/or severity prediction. Although there are numerous publications on the use and comparison of various severity stratification systems for acute pancreatitis in non-pregnant subjects, the authors have identified an interesting niche for the research. The team has identified four predictors developed and established a prediction nomogram model for pregnancy patients with moderate and severe acute pancreatitis. This model achieved good concordance indexes and may help guide doctors in the administration of APIP. This is a nicely presented and methodologically correct study, which would be interesting to many readers. I missed the comparison of the new nomogram system performance with other worldwide known prognostification systems, i.e. BISAP, Ranson, MODS and/or single biochemical markers (CRP, IL-6, etc.).
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My comments were addressed by the authors, I have no further questions.