UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS MEDICAL SCHOOL

May 09, 2022

World Journal of Gastrointestinal oncology

RE: Submission of <u>REVISED</u> **'Mini-Review paper' (**76527**)**

Dear Editor

Please find enclosed our REVISED Mini-Review entitled **"The implication of gut microbiome in immunotherapy for colorectal cancer."** to be considered for publication. We would like to thank you and the reviewers for your thoughtful evaluation of our manuscript and your most welcome comments/suggestions. Accordingly, we have now revised our manuscript thoroughly to reflect these comments.

Please find below a point-by-point **response** to <u>ALL</u> the issues raised by the Reviewers:

Reviewer #1:
Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Minor revision
Specific Comments to Authors: Dear Authors, your article is very interesting, well organized and written. You provides valuable review of the microbiome role in carcinogenesis and possible role in the cancer treatment.

1. Explanation of literature search and selection could improve the quality of your article, as the creation of the table with literature review. **AUTHOR RESPONSE: We thank the reviewer. We have made the appropriate editing. A ''Literature search'' section was added. The changes in the manuscript are presented below:**
   ''PubMed was searched to identify… other than English were excluded. Publications of abstracts were also excluded. ''

2. There is also 2 small letter mistakes in the last sentence of the Section 2 - USEFOR-USE FOR,
AUTHOR RESPONSE: We thank the reviewer. We have made the appropriate editing. *''USEFOR'' was changed to ''USE FOR''*

3. and in the title of the section 3- carcinogenesis instead of conigenesis
AUTHOR RESPONSE: We thank the reviewer. We have made the appropriate editing.

Reviewer #2:
Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)
Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)
Conclusion: Accept (General priority)
Specific Comments to Authors: Very attractive and up-to-date review. Useful paper.
AUTHOR RESPONSE: We thank the reviewer for the valuable evaluation of our manuscript.

EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Science editor:

The manuscript focuses on how the intestinal microbiota affects the immunotherapeutic response of patients with colorectal cancer.

1. There are similar articles reported, and there is no table summarizing relevant literature. Self-Citation Count: 4. The self-referencing rate should be less than 3%. It is unacceptable to have more than 3 references from the same journal. To resolve this issue and move forward in the peer-review/publication process, please revise your reference list accordingly. No literature search description
Language   Quality: Grade   A   (Priority   publishing)
Scientific   Quality: Grade   B   (Very   good)

AUTHOR RESPONSE: We thank the scientific editor for his valuable comment. We revised the references list. The reference 31 *"Koustas E, Sarantis P, Papavassiliou AG, Karamouzis MV. The Resistance Mechanisms of Checkpoint Inhibitors in Solid Tumors. Biomolecules. 2020;10:666. [PMID: 32344837DOI: 10.3390/biom10050666]"* **was replaced with** *"Jacob JB, Jacob MK, Parajuli P. Review of immune checkpoint inhibitors in immuno-*

oncology. Adv Pharmacol. 2021; 91: 111-139 [PMID: 34099106 DOI: 10.1016/bs.apha.2021.01.002]."

Company editor-in-chief:

Dear Editors, the manuscript is interesting, well written with lack of literature search explanation, table with the selected studies and two small letter mistakes.
1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes
AUTHOR RESPONSE: We thank the editor in chief.

2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes
AUTHOR RESPONSE: We thank the editor in chief.

3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes
AUTHOR RESPONSE: We thank the editor in chief.

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes
AUTHOR RESPONSE: We thank the editor in chief.
5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? There is a lack of literature search and selection methodology description
6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field?
7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes
AUTHOR RESPONSE: We thank the editor in chief.
8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? There is a lack of tables which could more clearly show results of different studies.
9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes
AUTHOR RESPONSE: We thank the editor in chief.

10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes
AUTHOR RESPONSE: We thank the editor in chief.

11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Yes
AUTHOR RESPONSE: We thank the editor in chief.

12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? 1. Yes, there is only two letter mistakes, the first in the last sentence of the Section 2 The functional role of the Gut microbiome , instead of USEFOR shoulčd be USE FOR, and the seceond the title of the next Section 3 The role of Microbiome in colon cinogenesis , instead of conigenesis should be carcinogenesis. 2.

AUTHOR RESPONSE: We thank the editor in chief. We made the appropriate changes

13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes except in explanation of literature search.

AUTHOR RESPONSE: We thank the editor in chief. We have made the appropriate editing. A ''Literature search'' section was added. The changes in the manuscript are presented below:

''PubMed was searched to identify... other than English were excluded. Publications of abstracts were also excluded. ''

14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Yes I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Please be sure to use Reference Citation Analysis (RCA) when revising the manuscript. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. For details on the RCA, please visit the following web site: https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/.Please provide decomposable Figures (in which all components are movable and editable), organize them into a single PowerPoint file. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022. 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.

AUTHOR RESPONSE: We thank the editor in chief. The figure was created with BioRender.com Accesed on 27 April 2020 (QN23UJU88O agreement number) which was added as an explaination in figure legend. Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022.

Trusting that we have adequately **addressed** the reviewers' concerns, we would like to thank you for your help in improving our work significantly.

Kind regards,
Koustas Evangelos, MD, PhD
Corresponding author