

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you very much for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "The efficacy and safety profile of 2-Dose SARS-COV2 vaccine in cancer patients: a multicenter observational study in China" (MS No: 78693).

Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made a correction which we hope meets with approval. We have addressed the comments raised by the reviewers, and the amendments are highlighted in red in the revised manuscript, Title page, abstract et. Point by point responses to the reviewers' comments is listed below this letter. Thank you! We hope that the revised version of the manuscript is now acceptable for publication in your journal.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Shengwei Cai

We would like to express our sincere thanks to the reviewers for their constructive and positive comments.

Replies to Reviewers

Specific Comments

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Author Response: Thank you very much for your professional comments and give us a chance to improve the quality of our manuscript. We had sent the manuscript to the "Bullet edits" professional English language editing company to polish the manuscript

further. Thank you!

1. More statistical results must be presented with proper details. Please furnish accordingly. Add Chi-square test in addition.

Author Response: Thank you very much for your professional comments. We had revised and added it in the Statistical analysis section. Thank you!

2. Literature survey section is not present. Make a separate section with 20 related papers minimum.

Author Response: Thank you very much for your professional comments. As this study was a multicenter observational study, then explore the efficacy and safety profile of 2-Dose SARS-COV2 vaccine in cancer patients by clinical data. It was not a systematic review analysis or literature review. So, we didn't add the literature survey section. We checked the other WJCC publications, we also did not find literature survey section in the observational study. But, if you feel that literature survey section was very important and essential for our study, we would consider add it in the next revised version according your comments. Thank you again!

3. Where is the research gap analysis? 4. No comparative study was given with respect to earlier papers.

Author Response: Thank you very much for your professional comments and good question. We had added the research gap analysis in the last paragraph, and compare the earlier papers in the discussion. Thank you very much for your professional comments.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Reviewer Comments to Author(s): The current observational study was conducted to assess the efficacy and safety of the 2-dose SARS-COV2 vaccine in cancer patients. According to the presented findings, the 2-dose SARS-CoV2 vaccine was efficacious and safe in cancer patients. Although it should focus on the efficacy of elderly cancer patients undergoing active immunosuppressive treatment. Overall, the systematic review is clear and well-written. The introduction is relevant with enough information. The method is clear and appropriate. I would suggest this Observational Study be published in Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology.

Author Response: Thank you very much for your professional comments and give us a chance to improve the quality of our manuscript. We had sent the manuscript to the “Bullet edits” professional English language editing company to polish the manuscript further. Thank you!