

Answering reviewers

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The Letter to the Editor is on an interesting topic. However the manuscript needs editing by an expert/software to improve language usage.

Answer: Thanks for your advice. We have carefully revised our manuscript for some minor mistakes and polish the language.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: This is a manuscript made to help clinicians by stating additional considerations to the existing review paper. It is still difficult to apply clinically, but I think it is a sufficient manuscript to be published.

Answer: Thanks for your approve, we all hope our letter can help shed more light on PC and improve its clinical dilemma.

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Just as a letter to the editor, authors summarized the main idea of the review. Moreover, the authors also added more therapeutic methods for PC patients to be evaluated in the future. For example, it carefully focused on the clinical trials' outcomes of new combination therapy and immunotherapy for PC, especially the combination of erlotinib and gemcitabine and the efficacy of PD-1 antagonist. The results on PD-1, as the authors mentioned, is a bit promising and we will keep an eye on future relative trials.

Answer: Thank you very much. We will also keep in touch with the latest advances in PC treatment and are always willing to share our opinions with all of the readers.