

# Reviewer Comments:

Here we present point-by-point responses to the issues raised in the peer-review report:

## Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

### Specific Comments to Authors:

**1)By analyzing the recent published findings on the diagnostic, prognostic, and predictive potential for PC of biomarkers identified in liquid biopsies, you conclude that liquid biopsies offer major opportunities to improve the screening, treatment guidance, and follow-up of cancer patients in general and patients with PC in particular. I have some reservations about this issue. First, the assessment of liquid biopsies is not practicable enough in PC and should be performed in systematic reviews.**

**Response:** We agree that we should be more cautious in our conclusions. We have introduced the following sentences in the revised manuscript to underscore the need for further research.

Page 3: Core tip: *“There remains a need to validate and verify the clinical value of liquid biopsies for PC in large-scale human trials using appropriate controls”*

Page 4: Introduction: *“However, unlike in some other cancers, the clinical applicability and reliability of liquid biopsy results have yet to be established in PC”*

Page 33: Conclusions: *“Considerable research efforts are required to verify the diagnostic and prognostic value of liquid biopsies in PC before their routine clinical implementation can be recommended.”*

**2) Second, I'm wondering the evaluation criteria for liquid biopsies in PC was not much enough.**

**Response:**We agree that no consensus has been established on the evaluation criteria for liquid biopsies in PC, supporting the need for further investigations on this issue, as now expressed in the revised manuscript (see the above additions to the text).

**3) Also, I recommend that you give a final polish to your typography and language expression to keep your view as concise as possible. Abbreviations should be used in the main text as they have been listed at above. Over all, your aforementioned review contains a lot of information. Readers will find this paper beneficial and informative.**

**Response:**The paper has been re-revised, as requested, and a list of the abbreviations used is now included before the Key words (we had to submit them as Supplementary Material as the uploading system did not allow this section)

## **LANGUAGE QUALITY**

**1)Please resolve all language issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report. Please be sure to have a native-English speaker edit the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, word usage, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, format, and general readability, so that the manuscript's language will meet our direct publishing needs.**

**Response:**The paper was prepared and has now been re-revised by a professional language editing service (see below).

## **EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS:**

**Science editor:** 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a Review of the Liquid Biopsy Approach to Pancreatic Cancer. The topic is within the scope of the WJGO (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: Readers will find this paper beneficial and informative.

**1)The authors should give a final polish to your typography and language expression. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered**

**Response:**The paper has been re-revised for a final “polish”. All questions raised by the reviewer have been addressed.

**2) Format:** There is 1 table and 1 figure; (4) References: A total of 186 references are cited, including 83 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There are 2 self-cited references. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. 3 Academic norms and rules: No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. The study was supported by Junta de Andalucia. The topic has not previously been published in the WJGO.

### **3) Issues raised:**

**(1) Please provide the English language classification issued by the language editing company**

**Response:**We attach an image of the signed certificate from the editing company.

**(2) Please provide the manuscript in MS Word format, and the manuscript in any other format will be rejected**

**Response:**This has been done.

**(3) 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)**

**Response:**We attach the approval document, highlighting the pertinent parts.

- (4) **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.** If an author of a submission is re-using a figure or figures published elsewhere, or that is copyrighted, the author must provide documentation that the previous publisher or copyright holder has given permission for the figure to be re-published; and correctly indicating the reference source and copyrights. For example, "Figure 1 Histopathological examination by hematoxylin-eosin staining (200 ×). A: Control group; B: Model group; C: Pioglitazone hydrochloride group; D: Chinese herbal medicine group. Citation: Yang JM, Sun Y, Wang M, Zhang XL, Zhang SJ, Gao YS, Chen L, Wu MY, Zhou L, Zhou YM, Wang Y, Zheng FJ, Li YH. Regulatory effect of a Chinese herbal medicine formula on non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. World J Gastroenterol 2019; 25(34): 5105-5119. Copyright ©The Author(s) 2019. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc[6]". And please cite the reference source in the references list. If the author fails to properly cite the published or copyrighted picture(s) or table(s) as described above, he/she will be subject to withdrawal of the article from BPG publications and may even be held liable.

**Response:** This figure was created by our team and has not been published elsewhere, so there are no copyright issues to address. It was prepared using Biorendersoftware and it is now indicated in the text. We have uploaded the figure in PowerPoint, as requested, although it appears that figures exported to PowerPoint with this software cannot then be modified.