

Reply to Reviewers

Dear WJCC Editorial Team and reviewers,

Thank you so much for your letter on 23th August, 2020, with the reviewers' constructive comments concerning our manuscript (Manuscript NO.58205). We did appreciate your amazingly high efficiency, prompt response, and kindly extension for this revision. And it is a great honor for us to have the opportunity to make revise. We have added necessary information according to your annotations, studied the comments carefully, and made corrections accordingly. The point-to-point reply to reviewers' comments is listed here and changes are made with tracked changes in the revised manuscript (marked copy) to highlight the revisions. Thank you very much!

And dear reviewers, we are really indebted to your insightful comments and constructive suggestions. We have changed our manuscript and added necessary information. Thank you for your wise suggestion and helpful correction! Hope all of you take good care of yourselves under COVID-19 pandemic.

Sincerely!

Shunda Wang & Menghua Dai

Reviewers

Specific Comments to Authors: The case report and related literature review are interesting. The condition described is very rare and deserves this clinical recap. I have a few minor remarks

1) Introduction 3rd line: please amend "...operation is regarded..."
6th line: "...metastases are irregular"; I think you mean they are rare?

Response: Thank you for your wise comments! We have already re-written these sentences in Introduction part to make it clearer and more accurate. In 3rd line, the sentence was changed to *only radical operation can be an optimal treatment to improve the prognosis*. In 6th line, it was changed to *PC with ovarian metastases is rare*.

2) Further diagnostic workup Firstly, this is the most important part of the diagnostic work up, thus I would not call it "Further Second, it is not clear that both masses were biopsied and if the biopsy was done percutaneously and ultrasound-guided in both cases, Please explain the biopsy techniques and needles used.

Response: Thank you very much for your useful comments! Firstly, according to your wise advice, we have already changed the incorrect statement. Secondly, we explain the detail of biopsy in Case presentation---Diagnostic work-up part. The both masses including pancreas and ovary were biopsied and it was ultrasound-guided with 22-gauge fine needle.

3) Discussion Please emphasize that the prognosis of this condition is very poor (3.5-month survival in the present case) and that surgery should be contemplated only after multidisciplinary discussion. On the other hand, chemotherapy may represent a better option Please emphasize the role of endoscopic ultrasound in diagnosing pancreatic neoplasms Please write "32nd" instead of "thirty-two"

Response: Thank you for your wise comments! We have added more explanation for the prognosis and surgery according to your opinions in Discussion part paragraph 4 and paragraph 7. The case in our manuscript had 3.5-month survival time. The longest survival time was 2 year in literatures. However, some cases in literature reported did not mention the prognosis or lost up. We admit that chemotherapy is useful. Finally, we also describe the application and importance of endoscopic ultrasound in diagnosing pancreatic diseases in Discussion part paragraph 5 line 8-15.

4) Conclusion I would say "strongly recommended" instead of "heavily"

Response: Thank you for your careful check! We have already changed it in Conclusion part.

5) The following references should be added -Fusaroli, P., D'Ercole, M.C., De Giorgio, R., Serrani, M., Caletti, G. Contrast harmonic endoscopic ultrasonography in the characterization of pancreatic metastases (With Video) *Pancreas*, 2014;43:584-587. -Moris, M., Raimondo, M., Woodward, T.A., Skinner, V.J., Arcidiacono, P.G., Petrone, M.C., De Angelis, C., Manfrè, S., Carrara, S., Jovani, M., Fusaroli, P., Wallace, M.B. International intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasms registry: Long-term results based on the new guidelines. *Pancreas* 2017;46:306-310 -Fusaroli, P., Kypraios, D., Eloubeidi, M.A.,

Caletti, G. Levels of evidence in endoscopic ultrasonography: A systematic review. Digestive Diseases and Sciences, 2012;57:602-609.

Response: Thank you for your helpful opinions. We read these papers carefully and also cited them in our manuscript in Discussion part paragraph 5.

Finally, thank you very much for your wise comments! Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval.

Science Editor: 5 Issues raised: (1) I found the authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s); (2) Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

Response: Thank you for your wise comments and careful checking! We have uploaded the necessary files about funding during the revision process. Because they are in Chinese version, we hope it will not influence your checking. And we also put figures into PPT to make it editable and also upload it. Besides, we have also uploaded the final manuscript and the manuscript with tracked change to facilitate your checking.