In reply to the comment on our article Belina et al, 2005 [1], We think that the study has provided evidence and supported previous reports [2, 3] about the benefits of surgical intervention in treating chronic pancreatitis even in advanced stages.

While the comment authors agreed with the previous conclusion, they cannot agree with the preference of DPPHE/PJA in comparison with PD/PPPD procedure as there are considerable differences in the demographic and clinical presentation between the two groups before operation. We still believe that the significant strength of changes within the same group comparing preoperative and postoperative overall quality of life and pain scores is ascribed to the surgical procedure used in each group.

We think using numerical values to compare the postoperative outcome with preoperative scores is a reliable method to report about each procedure separately. When considering the degree of change in quality of life, we showed high global quality of life improvement in both groups according to Osoba (>20) [4], with 6.8% higher improvement in DPPHE/PJA than PD/PPPD.

Although the 2 groups are not exactly matched preoperatively due to inevitable technical and clinical selection bias, we believe that higher quality of life improvement could be gained with DPPHE/PJA. However, we agree with the authors that in comparing the 2 procedures, the scaling of the degree of change according to Osoba [4] might not show significant difference between the 2 procedures.

We agree also with the comment authors’ suggestion to categorize patients as showing a clinically significant improvement or not, based on the size of differences identified by Osoba [4], and reporting the proportion of patients in each group who achieved clinically significant improvement. However, we have been limited by the small number of patients in each group. We also think that this comparison needs high number of patients.

The QLQ-C30 has been validated to be used in chronic pancreatitis setting and our study started earlier than the proposed validated and specific C30/PAN26 [5] by the comment authors. However, we appreciate their effort and we will take their advice in using C30/PAN26 in future work.
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