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Reviewer’s report:

I read with interest the revised paper by Theodossis et al. entitled “IAP alterations after large pancreatic pseudocyst transcutaneous drainage”. The article is short and to the point on a clinically relevant topic and what some even call a “sexy subject”. We thank the authors for their point by point answers to all the reviewers comments. The article has been substantially improved in its present form and we only have minor comments.

I believe that The English still can be improved here and there.

Please state results with 1 digit after the comma so IAP was 5.1 instead of 5.07, etc…

Give SD for each result

In abstract how can PRE-drainage IAP be higher in group A than group B (since in group B no drainage was performed – this is a bit confusing???) – please rephrase by stating that baseline IAP was higher in group A vs group B

Please state the pseudocyst volume also for group B

Omit Table 1 since it represents the same information as figure 1

I would add a Table with the patient demographics of group A and B: age, gender, BMI, volume of pseudocyst, baseline IAP, hos stay,… with p-value when appropriate,

Please add in methods how Cabd was calculated and not in results: please rephrase formula Cabd = volume of fluid drained/ (pre drainage IAP – post drainage IAP)

How many patients had IAP > 12mmHg (or thus IAH)

I would suspect that these patients had a lower Cabd and thus a higher drop in IAP for the same amount drained – can you provide some results on this and please discuss this issue – even if you did not found any difference.

Also was Cabd lower in patients with high BMI?

In conclusion: this is a very interesting small study, congratulations. Please take into account the comments above.
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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