

**World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology**, Ms. No. 67921

hMLH1 methylation and microsatellite instability in sporadic colorectal tumors among Filipinos

*Loraine Kay D Cabral, Cynthia A Mapua, Filipinas F Natividad, Caecilia H C Sukowati, Edgardo R Cortez, Ma. Luisa D Enriquez, and The Colorectal Cancer Study Group*

June 23<sup>st</sup>, 2021

Editors-in-Chief

World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Baishideng Publishing Group Inc.

Pleasanton, CA, USA

Dear respected Editors,

We submit the revised version of our Ms. 67921 for publication in World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology. We thank the overall positive comments of the editors and reviewers. We are pleased that this Ms is conditionally accepted. In response to the letter of the editorial office, we carried out minor revision of the previous version and prepared a point-by-point answer (As) which addresses the comments and questions (Qs) by the editors and reviewers. We hope to have comprehensively and successfully dealt with the critiques, which further helped to improve the quality of the Ms and expect this may be now officially accepted for publication.

On behalf of all the co-authors, I thank you for your attention and send you our best regards.

Sincerely yours,



Kay Cabral

Corresponding Author



Caecilia Sukowati, PhD

## ANSWERS TO THE EDITORS

### Company editor-in-chief

I recommend the manuscript to be published in the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology.

*We thank the Editor-in-Chief for the acceptance of this Ms.*

### Science editor

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a retrospective study of the expression of hmlh1 in colorectal tumors. The topic is within the scope of the WJG. (1) Classification: Grade C and Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: Authors suggest a key role in CRC from Philipinnes; (3) Format: There are 3 tables and 3 figures; (4) References: A total of 37 references are cited, including 3 references published in the last 3 years; (5) There are no self-cited references. (6) Homogenized references and some PMID and/or DOI are required. Language, Clase B. Authors declare scientific formation in enlgish language. Just a pair of typing or grammar mistakes. Authors have a institutional evaluation. However, this is since 2006. On the manuscript is not commented about collection time. This is an invited manuscript. Highlights are lacking. Discussion requires be enriched with recent advances related to this study. Conclusions requires be specific about the relevance from numbers and percentages on the study.

*We thank the Science Editor for their insightful comment. As suggested, we had added some more recent references (no. 23, 36, 40-44 in revised Ms) and expanded the discussion enriched with recent advances of this study. We had improved the conclusion in the abstract as your suggestion. However, we did not put values here since they had been clearly indicated in the results. The references format also had been homogenized and PMID and/or DOI links had been provided.*

*Regarding your comment on institutional evaluation board of 2006, this is a study using The St. Luke's Medical Center CRC Biobank with the protocol approved since 2006. The protocol was renewed and up-graded every year until 2014, including when the analysis of this study was carried out. The copy of 2014 renewal had been added in our revised submission online.*

## ANSWERS TO THE REVIEWERS

### Answer to Reviewer 1

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors:

The authors investigate the MSI status and hMLH1 methylation in CRC Filipino patients by High Resolution Melting (HRM) analysis and using bisulfite conversion and methylation specific PCR (MS-PCR). The result found that hMLH1 methylation and high MSI status have prognostic value. In general, this

study is well designed and the manuscript is well written, while based on the shortcomings of this paper, it is suggested to retry after revision.

*We thank the Reviewer for their comments, especially in pointing out that this Ms is well designed and well written. We had revised the Ms as your suggestion below.*

The specific comments are as follows that can be considered by authors:

Q1: Line 252 What does “or /” mean?

*A1: The sentence had been corrected.*

Q2: Line 314 “35” can be “35%”.

*A2: It had been corrected.*

Q3: Line 356 There are two “of”.

*A3: It had been corrected.*

Q4: Line 369 needs a “.” at the end of the sentence.

*A4: It had been corrected.*

Q5: Line 522 “difference” can be “Difference”.

*A5: It had been corrected.*

Q6: Line 523 Suggest deletion of “As indicated also in the”.

*A6: The phrase had been deleted.*