

Dear World Journal of Clinical Oncology,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised draft of our manuscript entitled “National Comprehensive Cancer Network(NCCN) Guidelines Compliance of a Sarcoma Service: a Retrospective Review” by Alan T. Blank, Brandon Larson, Sara Shaw, Connor Wakefield, Tricia King, Kevin B. Jones, and R. Lor Randall. We truly appreciate you and the reviewers time and effort in providing feedback on our manuscript. We have been able to incorporate the requested changes within the manuscript which have been highlighted throughout.

Below is a point-by-point response to the reviewer’s feedback.

Comments from Reviewer 1

Reviewer #1: World Journal of Clinical Oncology 22 February 2020 Manuscript ID: Reviewer’s Code: 02953796 " National Comprehensive Cancer Network(NCCN) Guidelines Compliance of a Sarcoma Service: a Retrospective Review" Dear editorial Teams This is well design article . However, I have several suggestions that I think would improve the quality of research: a) The aim of study well is not stated? Is this validation study ? b) Structurally article as introduction, Methods, results, and Discussion should be amended and revised. Is this retrospective or prospective study? c) Given the sample size compared to Guideline sample , and patients groups in the study, the findings cannot be confirmed as conclusive? d) Explain and discus what the research adds to what is already known? e) In Conclusion section, the Conclusion should be expressed only? f) Which patients of Sarcoma benefit from this study? please discus? Please explain applications this study in future? Parisa Azimi, MD,

Comment 1: a) The aim of study well is not stated? Is this validation study ?

Response: We agree, we changed the wording of the AIM to “to evaluate our compliance of NCCN sarcoma guidelines at a major NCI designated center and to report instances of deviation that could be used for future studies to improve patient care”.

Comment 2: Structurally article as introduction, Methods, results, and Discussion should be amended and revised. Is this a retrospective study or prospective study?

Response: We agree, we added the following test to the abstract “Data was collected retrospectively” and to the materials and methods section of manuscript “This was a retrospective study that utilized data that was collected prospectively through routine care of patients.”

Comment 3: c) Given the sample size compared to Guideline sample, and patients groups in the study, the findings cannot be confirmed as conclusive?

Response: We agree, we changed the following verbiage in the conclusion section of abstract. We deleted “By following these NCCN guidelines we believe that patient care can be optimized and each case treated on an individually appropriate manner” and replaced with ‘Although adherence to NCCN was reported to be very high future prospective studies are required to investigate whether NCCN guidelines impact patient outcomes.”

Comment 4: d) Explain and discuss what the research adds to what is already known?

Response: We agree, within the discussion section we added the following wording “This study is the first ever to investigate a NCI designated center’s adherence to NCCN sarcoma treatment guidelines. Although previously reported studies have investigated the relationship of NCCN guideline adherence and patient outcomes in various other malignancies no one has evaluated sarcoma in this regard. It is necessary to shed light on adherence to NCCN sarcoma treatment guidelines as sarcoma is a rare entity that can be encountered in non-specialty settings and NCI designated centers. Furthermore, there are a wide variety of sarcoma subtypes with varying degrees of malignant potential that may alter providers adherence to NCCN guidelines.”

Comment 5: e) In Conclusion section, the Conclusion should be expressed only?

Response: We agree, in the conclusions section we removed the wording “The NCCN has published a series of evidence based workup and treatment guidelines for many forms of malignancy, including sarcoma”

Comment 6: f) Which patients of Sarcoma benefit from this study? please discuss? Please explain applications this study in future?

Response: We agree, we added the following wording to the discussion section “It is clear that NCCN treatment guidelines can easily be adhered to regardless of histologic diagnosis and that all patients can possibly benefit.” And “This study will promote future investigations into adherence with NCCN sarcoma treatment guidelines in both NCI and non-NCI designated centers.”

We look forward to hearing back from you regarding our submission. Please feel free to ask if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Alan T. Blank
Department of Orthopedic Surgery
Rush University Medical Center
1611 W. Harrison St, Suite 300, Chicago, IL 60612
Tel: 312.432.2397, Fax: 708.409.5179, Email: alan.blank@rushortho.com