Dear Editor,

First of all, we would like to express our gratitude and appreciation for the fast review process of the World Journal of Methodology.

About your reviewers, after thanking him/her about the comments we would like to answer separately to every of his/her very well addressed concerns.

Authors’ answer: We would like to thank the reviewers and the editor for the well-stated comments that helped us ameliorate the quality of our manuscript. All the changes that the reviewer proposed were made in accordance to all comments. The English-language grammatical presentation was improved by a professional English language editing company. Please find attached the invoice of the language editing company.

Reviewer #1:
Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors

- Stent a pancreaticojejunostomy: Is always necessary? (Title) - I recommend to change the Title as "Stent a pancreaticojejunostomy after pancreatoduodenectomy: Is always necessary?" This clarification is not a purely formal act. In the future, this clarification will facilitate the inclusion of the article in search lists based on keywords.

Authors’ answer: Dear reviewer, thank you very much for well-stated comments. Title was modified accordingly.

- high risk (Page 7) - high-risk is better. 10 point (Page 8) - 10-point is better. significantly prolonged absence of bowel function (Page 9) - the word "absence" is too categorical. It is better to use the words "decrease", "disturbance" and so on. In 1999, Roder et al. (Page 10) - Roder and Stein is right. long term outcomes (Page 11) - long-term is better. Several clinical control trials and seven randomized control trials have tried to assess... (Page 12) - "Several clinical controlled trials and seven randomized controlled trials..." is right. Recently, two Meta–analyses were published aiming to summarize the currently available evidence. In the Meta analysis by Jiang Y et al., four randomized controlled trials and six non-randomized trials with a total of 2101 patients were included [32] (Page 12) - please spell the term as meta-analysis (two times in this piece of text) without capitalization. high quality evidence (Page 13), high quality data (Page 14 and Page 16) - high-quality is better. In practise (Page 14 and also Page 15) - in practice is right. high risk (Page 14, three times) - high-risk is better. internal and external stents for
pancreatojejunostomy during PD (Page 15) - please use the same spelling (pancreaticojejunostomy) throughout the text.

- **Authors’ answer:** Dear reviewer, thank you very much for well-stated comments. All the changes were made accordingly.

- The formation of Reference List is extremely inaccurate. In some references all the Authors are indicated, in some - only a part with addition of "et al.", the initials appear both before and after the surnames, in some places PMID and DOI are indicated, in others not. It should be understood that Authors should have great respect for the requirements set out in the Instructions for Authors. The list of References must be compiled IN STRICT ACCORDANCE with the Instructions for Authors!!!

  **Authors’ answer:** Dear reviewer, thank you very much for well-stated comments. References were reformed in line with journal’s instructions.

**Reviewer #2:**

**Scientific Quality:** Grade D (Fair)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Major revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** Running title does not havr author name. Role of nutrition not highlighted in POPF. Transpapillary stents having any role ? Any role of fibrin glue ? No light on lymphatic leakage post stent placement ? Add size of stents USED

  **Authors’ answer:** Dear reviewer, thank you very much for well-stated comments. Details regarding the stents that have been used, the role of nutrition and the role of fibrin glue have been added in accordance with your comments.

**Reviewer #3:**

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade A (Priority Publishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General Priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** I recommend acceptance of manuscript.

  **Authors’ answer:** We would like to thank the reviewer for the kind comments and recommendations.
Kind regards,

Athina A. Samara, MD, MSc