

MANUSCRIPT REVISION

Dear Director,

I hereby send you the revised manuscript with the following modifications suggested by reviewers and editors:

POINT-BY-POINT RESPONSE

- 1) Peer review: *This article is a well written article which determined Endoscopic ultrasound fine-needle aspiration (EUS-FNA) with molecular analysis has been suggested to improve pancreatic cysts diagnosis. They proved Molecular analysis can improve the classification of pancreatic cysts as mucinous or non-mucinous. It is provided a new direction for pancreatic cysts diagnosis.*

No changes required

- 2) Language quality:
No changes required

- 3) Editorial office's comments:

- a. Science director:

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes an observational study of the molecular analysis of pancreatic cystic neoplasm. The topic is within the scope of the WJGE. (1) Classification: Grade A; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This article is a well written article which determined Endoscopic ultrasound fine-needle aspiration with molecular analysis has been suggested to improve pancreatic cysts diagnosis. They proved molecular analysis can improve the classification of pancreatic cysts as mucinous or non-mucinous. It is provided a new direction for pancreatic cysts diagnosis; and (3) Format: There are 4 tables and 1 figure. A total of 43 references are cited, including 6 references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation:

Classification: Grade A. A language editing certificate was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, the Institutional Review Board Approval Form, and informed consent. The authors need to provide the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement, and fill out the STROBE checklist with page numbers. 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 Boston Scientific. The topic has not previously been published in the WJGE. The corresponding author has not published articles in the BPG. 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) I found the authors did not provide the original figures. 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; (3) I found the authors did not add the PMID and DOI in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout; (4) I found the authors did not write the "article highlight" section. Please write the "article highlights" section at the end of the main text; and (5) the author should number the references in Arabic numerals according to the citation order in the text. The reference numbers will be superscripted in square brackets at the end of the sentence with the citation content or after the cited author's name, with no spaces. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

We have signed and sent Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement. We have also filled out the STROBE checklist with page numbers.

Issues raised:

- Approved grant application form: I attach the funding donation document from Boston Scientific.

- Original figures: I have made Figure 1 with PowerPoint and attached the file (59721 Figures).
- We placed tables in 59721-tables.docx
- I changed reference format as asked, following this journal reference guidelines.
- We wrote “article highlights” and included them at the end of the main text.

b. Editorial office director:

I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

No changes required

c. Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report and the full text of the manuscript, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted with major revisions. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, authors need to correct the issues raised by the editor to meet the publishing requirements.

We have corrected the issues raised by the editor as explained above.

We really appreciate the reviewers' comments, which we believe have contributed to improve our paper. We hope to meet publishing requirements.

Kind regards,

Raquel Herranz Pérez, Felipe de la Morena López, Pedro L Majano Rodríguez, Francisca Molina Jiménez, Lorena Vega Piris and Cecilio Santander Vaquero