

## Response to reviewers

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

**Manuscript NO:** 51979

**Manuscript Type:** RETROSPECTIVE COHORT STUDY

**Title:** FOLFIRINOX versus Gemcitabine/Nab-paclitaxel for Treatment of Metastatic Pancreatic Cancer: Single-center Cohort Study

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for forwarding the reviewer's comments on our manuscript. We appreciate their insightful comments and believe that they have improved the quality of our paper. We hope that the revised version of our manuscript meets your requirements for publication. The following attachment comprises replies to the reviewers' specific comments.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.

### Reviewer 1

This study was a cohort study conducted only in a single center. However, the results were very interesting. My comments are as follows: What was the regimen of the second-line chemotherapy? How was the rate of patients who can use the second-line chemotherapy?

**Reply:** *Thank you for your practical and essential questions. Second-line chemotherapy was conducted in 58 patients. There was a difference in treatment regimen between the two groups. In FOLFIRINOX group, gemcitabine-based regimens were commonly used. On the other hand, in Gem+nabPTX group patients, 5-FU (capecitabine) based regimens were commonly used. (summarized in Table below)*

FOLFIRINOX Group	n
Gemcitabine + erlotinib	24
Other gemcitabine-based regimen	8
Oral 5-FU (e.g. capecitabine)	6
Gem+nabPTX Group	n
Capecitabine + oxaliplatin	10
Oral 5-FU (e.g. capecitabine)	6
FOLFIRINOX	4

*We described about this point in discussion session and that paragraph is highlighted in the revised manuscript.*

## **Reviewer 2**

There is a lack of data regarding a direct comparison of Gem+nabPTX (a combination of gemcitabine and nab-paclitaxel) vs FOLFIRINOX in terms of the treatment outcome. Although this is a retrospective cohort study, the result has reference significance for clinical practice. Of course, the result needs RCT to confirm.

**Reply:** *We authors totally agree with your opinion. As you mentioned, well-designed randomized controlled trial will be helpful to confirm and validate the results of this retrospective study. We mentioned this point in discussion session.*