

Dear Dr. Yu,

The following is a detailed account of our responses to the comments of reviewers.

**Title page and conflict-of –interest statement**

The title page has been edited to fit the journal style based on the format of the sample manuscript

**Core tip**

A core tip has been added

**Core audio tip**

Audio file submitted

**Minor point: The section on serum miRNA should include a differentiation between free and vesicular miRNA as the latter may be more reliable.**

The section on serum miRNA has been expanded to incorporate this suggestion. We have also added a section on exosomes in the future directions section.

**Table 1 displays a selection of biomarkers analyzed in pancreatic cancer/diseases. Could the authors state how these markers were selected, e.g. most common, most interesting, etc.? ?**

This list is certainly not all inclusive. In our opinion, the selected biomarkers were appropriately representative of each category.

**The authors state that “CA 19-9 is an approved biomarker for tumor detection in PDAC”. CA 19-9 might be useful for follow-up or as a prognostic marker; however it has in general failed as detection -in the sense of diagnostic & screening- tool. ?**

We agree that although it is approved for use, clinical utility is limited and it is not appropriate as a screening marker. We have modified the sentence.

**The authors might want to include a short paragraph regarding uniform requirements for biomarker research, which is important for future research with an increasing number of candidate markers.**

Thank you for your comment. We have included a short paragraph regarding key characteristics of an ideal biomarker. We hope that this is of help to researchers in this field.

Thank you for your time and effort in reviewing our manuscript.

Sincerely,

**Shounak Majumder, MD**

Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology  
Mayo Clinic  
Rochester, MN