

Dear Editorial Committee,

Thank you very much for reconsidering our manuscript for review and possible publication in your journal. We welcome your feedback on our review and we are confident that it will add further scientific value to our review.

Next, we answer the clarifications that you request. In addition, we have highlighted in red in the text the changes introduced.

Reply to comments:

Reviewer #1:
The author introduced the new perspectives in the management of small cell lung cancer, but did not summarize and present their own views, which is limited to the readers.

Thank you so much for the comments. We have made a comment trying to summarize our own perspectives as requested, we hope they meet your expectations.

some problems: 1. The first and second Key Word are the same.

We have removed the key word "SCLC". Thanks.

2. Please check the order of references, such as "[72,73] [20,21].", "[92] [93] [94] [95].", "[106-104].", etc.

We have fixed the errors that we have identified. Thank you.

3. Some abbreviations should provide the full name at the first time in the paper, such as "SBRT, PCI".

We have defined in the text the full name at the first time in the paper. Thanks.

(1) Science editor:

Summary of the Peer-Review Report: the main drawback of this paper is lacking authors' own views, minor issues including reference order, abbreviations should be used per journal standard.

We have made the pertinent changes that were requested of us.

(3) Format: There are 2 figures and 3 tables;

We would like the 2 figures and the 3 tables to be included. If you think we should delete anything, tell us which one you think has the least value for the manuscript, by your point of view.

(4) References: A total of 188 references are cited, with 47 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There are 2 self-cited references. The self-referencing rates should be less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations (i.e. those that are most closely related to the topic of the manuscript) and remove all other improper self-citations. If the authors fail to address the critical issue of self-citation, the editing process of this manuscript will be terminated.

We have included only 2 self-cited references, so we met the requirements. Thanks.

and (6) References recommendations: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially references published by the peer reviewer(s) him/herself (themselves). If the authors find the peer reviewer(s) request for the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself (themselves), please send the peer reviewer's ID number to editorialoffice@wjgnet.com. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately.

We have no comment in this setting.

Issues raised:

(2) The “Author Contributions” section is missing.

This section is previously described on page number 2.

(2) Figure legends should be written per journal standard; (4) Manuscript format should be updated per journal standard

So we have done.

(5) Copyright License Agreement and Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form are missing (6) 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

We have done and updated it.

(7) PMID and DOI numbers are missing 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.

We have reviewed and made the necessary changes.

(3) *Company editor-in-chief:*

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript is a review on management of small cell lung cancer . The topic is within the scope of the WJCO. (1) Classification: Grade D; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: the main drawback of this paper is lacking authors’ own views, minor issues including reference order, abbreviations should be use per journal standard. (3) Format: There are 2 figures and 3 table; (4) References: A total of 188 references are cited, with 47 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There are 2 self-cited references. The self-referencing rates should be less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations (i.e. those that are most closely related to the topic of the manuscript) and remove all other improper self-citations. If the authors fail to address the critical issue of self-citation, the editing process of this manuscript will be terminated; and (6) References recommendations: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially references published by the peer reviewer(s) him/herself (themselves). If the authors find the peer reviewer(s) request for the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself (themselves), please send the peer reviewer’s ID number to editorialoffice@wjgnet.com. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. Author provided a personal language statement. 3 Academic norms and rules: Not apply. No academic misconduct was found in the Google/Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. The topic has not previously been published in the WJCO. 5 Issues raised: (1) Core-tip audio is missing; (2) The “Author Contributions” section is missing. (3) Figure legends should be written per journal standard; (4) Manuscript format should be updated per journal standard; (5) Copyright License Agreement and Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form are missing; (6) 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. (7) PMID and DOI numbers are missing 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. 6 Re-Review: Not required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional Acceptance.

We have reviewed and made the necessary changes.

We are confident that these modifications are considered adequate, and that they respond to the answers of the reviewers and editors, and that the editorial committee of the journal will definitely reconsider the publication of our review.

We hope to hear from you soon.

Best regards,

C. Pangua, J Rogado, et al.