

Reviewer #1

Specific Comments to Authors: SUA levels are associated with total cancer risk. Due to the dual effect of uric acid on cancer, the relationship of SUA levels and most of specific-site cancer remains unclear. few previously published studies have focused on SUA levels and the incidence of cancer at specific sites, and none of them highlighted HBP cancer. Chong-Fei Huang et al conducted this study to evaluate the associations between SUA and HBP cancer risk based on the UK Biobank cohort. The methods are properly presented, the results are presented on 6 tables and 5 figures and are clearly discussed. The data was rich, and the author analyzed the results from many angles. The references are quite appropriate to the subject of research. I recommend accepting this manuscript for publication after a minor editing. The first paragraph of the "DISCUSSION" part seems to be better placed in the "RESULTS" part. The discussion does not need to present the results.

Answer: Thank you very much for your comments, and the first paragraph of the "DISCUSSION" part has been placed in the "RESULTS" part in accordance with your comments.

Reviewer #2

Specific Comments to Authors: The authors of the submitted manuscript aim to investigate the associations between SUA levels and incidence of hepatobiliary-pancreatic cancer. The cohort involved 444 462 participants free of cancer from the UK Biobank. The analysis showed that SUA is likely to have gender-specific effects on hepatobiliary-pancreatic cancer. High SUA levels are a risk factor for pancreatic cancer in females, and for gallbladder cancer in males. A U-shaped association with liver cancer risk is identified. Although the analyses are well performed, I have minor comments: a- Needs language polishing. b- Recommends that the RESULTS are described separately.

Answer: Thank you very much for your comments. We have revised the

manuscript according to your advice and the language of the manuscript has been formally and professionally edited again.

Reviewer #3

Specific Comments to Authors: In this prospective cohort study, 444,462 participants free of cancer from the UK Biobank was included. They investigated the associations between SUA levels and incidence of hepatobiliary-pancreatic cancer: SUA levels were measured at baseline, and the incidence of hepatobiliary-pancreatic cancer was determined by contacting the cancer registry. The HRs and 95% CIs between SUA levels and hepatobiliary-pancreatic cancer were investigated with multiple adjusted Cox regression models adjusted for potential confounders. I have no objections as far as methods are concern. This topic is actual and well described. The manuscript is well written and very interesting, and authors presented also the limitations of the study.

Answer: Thank you very much for your positive comments.

Reviewer #4

Specific Comments to Authors: This study investigated the associations between SUA levels and incidence of hepatobiliary-pancreatic cancer. I read the manuscript carefully, and found that the manuscript is very well designed and the results are interesting. I recommend accepting it for publication after a minor editing.

Answer: Thank you very much for your positive comments.

EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

(1) *Science editor*: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a prospective study of the associations between serum uric acid and hepatobiliary-pancreatic cancer. The topic is within the scope of the WJG. (1) Classification: Grade A and

three Grades B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This study investigated the associations between SUA levels and incidence of hepatobiliary-pancreatic cancer. The manuscript is very well designed and the results are interesting. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 6 tables and 5 figures. A total of 47 references are cited, including 18 references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Four Grades B. A language editing certificate issued by AJE was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement, and the Institutional Review Board Approval Form. Written informed consent was waived. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China and Startup Fund for the 100 Top Talents Program, Sun Yat-sen University. The topic has not previously been published in the WJG. 5 Issues raised: (1) 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) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; and (3) The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Answer: Thank you for your comments. (1) The funding agency copy of approval document of Professor Meng’s has been uploaded. Professor Yuan’s Startup Fund for the 100 Top Talents Program is a talent plan, there is no approved grant application form or copy of approval document. I have deleted Professor Yuan’s funding. (2) Original pictures have been put in one Power Point file. (3) The “Article Highlights” section has been added before

the References section.

(2) *Editorial office director*: I have checked the comments written by the science editor. The authors need to provide original Institutional Review Board Approval Form (Chinese version).

Answer: Thank you for your comments. The Chinese version of Institutional Review Board Approval Form has been uploaded.

(3) *Company editor-in-chief*: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before its final acceptance, the author(s) must provide the Chinese version of the ethical approval document.

Answer: Thank you for your comments. We have revised the manuscript in accordance of reviewers' and editors' comments. The Chinese version of Institutional Review Board Approval Form has been uploaded.