

Kui Zhao  
Department of Gastroenterology,  
Affiliated Hospital of Zunyi Medical University,  
Zunyi 563000, Guizhou Province, China.  
E-mail: Kuizhao95858@msn.com.

August 13, 2021

Dear Editor,

We would like to resubmit the revised manuscript entitled “The role of immune escape in different digestive tumours” for consideration by *World Journal of Clinical Cases*. We would like to thank the reviewers for thoroughly reviewing our manuscript and making many thoughtful comments. We were very pleased to see that all reviewers recognized the novelty of our work. We have added significant new data, described in detail below, and revised the manuscript to address reviewers’ comments. Here are our point-by-point responses:

***Reviewer #1:***

***Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)***

***Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)***

***Conclusion: Major revision***

***Specific Comments to Authors: Dear authors, The reviewed manuscript is devoted to an actual topic, since the position of immunotherapy as a pillar of systemic cancer treatment has been firmly established over the past decade. The authors attempted to generalize the available data on biomolecular aspects and pathological pathways involved in the imbalance between the immune system and tumor in the digestive tract area. Highlighted factors could theoretically be part of potential combination strategies, including combinations with existing local and systemic approaches, which would justify novel therapies for different digestive tumors***

***1 Title. The title does not reflect the main hypothesis of the manuscript. 2 Abstract. Abstract is written in general phrases without clarification and specifics. It is possible to expand the abstract and strengthen the scientific style by those leading pathways and factors that theoretically generalized the authors in the manuscript. 3 Key words. Key words are not reflecting the focus of the manuscript. 4 Background. Manuscript does not adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study. 5 Methods. It was not required. 6 Results. The results are written in vague and scattered throughout the text of the manuscript. 7 Discussion. In the article under review, a rather complex and interesting topic is considered, however, the authors summarizing the material gave rather succinct conclusions and an undeveloped discussion. The text of the article gives mainly***

*superficial ideas about the problem, which currently requires deep processing of the text. 8 Illustrations and tables. For a better perception of the article, authors need to add a pivot table with the received review data. The figure does not contain explanations and does not fully reflect the content of the manuscript. 9 Biostatistics. Not used. 10 Units. Not used. 11 References. The volume and quality of the scientific literature used is sufficient. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. The manuscript requires revision and correction. 13 Research methods and reporting. Not used. 14 Ethics statements. Ethics committee or institutional considerations are not applicable.*

**Comment 1:** Abstract is written in general phrases without clarification and specifics. It is possible to expand the abstract and strengthen the scientific style by those leading pathways and factors that theoretically generalized the authors in the manuscript.

**Answer:**

Thank you for your recognition of our work. Based on the comment 1, we did find that the abstract lacked an in-depth introduction to the main content of the article. Therefore, we added a brief summary of some immune escape mechanisms in the abstract section, such as “Tumor cells and their cytokines impair the activity of T cells, NK cells, macrophages and other immune cells through various ways.....immune cells.”

**Comment 2:** In the article under review, a rather complex and interesting topic is considered, however, the authors summarizing the material gave rather succinct conclusions and an undeveloped discussion. The text of the article gives mainly superficial ideas about the problem, which currently requires deep processing of the text.

**Answer:**

In view of the review opinion “the text requires deep processing”, we read the references in depth again. We carried out the latest relevant literature reading in order to explore some hidden knowledge related to this paper. And we found that: 1) There were few studies on immune escape in liver cancer; 2) NF- $\kappa$ B is considered to be a key link in the carcinogenesis of the human digestive system; 3) There may be a common pathway between the PD-L1/PD-1 axis and CD47-mediated immune escape, which is extremely significant for the further study of anti-immunotherapy. There are explain in detail in corresponding sections of the article.

**Comment 3:** For a better perception of the article, authors need to add a pivot table with the received review data. The figure does not contain explanations and does not fully reflect the content of the manuscript.

**Answer:**

Thank you for your suggest. After discussion, we decided to remove the original picture in the article and replace it with a table to make the article more concise and clear. The table can be downloaded in the attachment (Table 1).

**Reviewer #2:**

**Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)**

**Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)**

**Conclusion: Rejection**

**Specific Comments to Authors:** *The authors reviewed the mechanisms of immune escape in tumour cells of the digestive system, this is indeed an important direction to provide some valuable ideas for the current study. However, I question the quality of the paper, because there are lots of references that published 5 years ago. For example, the sentence "In recent years, in-depth study of the digestive system has resulted in the identification of factors related to immune escape. For example, in a study on the relationship between intestinal flora and C.....", in this paragraph, the authors cite references that published in the year 2014, I don't think this achievements can reflect the recent advancements in this area. So, I prefer to reject this manuscript with regret, and hope this will not dis-encourage you.*

**Comment:** The authors reviewed the mechanisms of immune escape in tumour cells of the digestive system, this is indeed an important direction to provide some valuable ideas for the current study. However, I question the quality of the paper, because there are lots of references that published 5 years ago. For example, the sentence "In recent years, in-depth study of the digestive system has resulted in the identification of factors related to immune escape. For example, in a study on the relationship between intestinal flora and C.....", in this paragraph, the authors cite references that published in the year 2014, I don't think this achievements can reflect the recent advancements in this area. So, I prefer to reject this manuscript with regret, and hope this will not dis-encourage you.

**Answer:**

Thank you for your advice. References that are too old are really not enough to reflect current research progress, we all agree with the you, so we updated the references, such as references numbered 13, 18, 20, 31, 36 and so on. Including the reference mentioned in the comment above.

**Company editor-in-chief:** *I recommend the manuscript to be published in the World Journal of Clinical Cases.*

**Answer:**

Thank you very much. I have revised the manuscript according to the comments, with a view to finally publishing it in the World Journal of Clinical Cases.