

We are pleased to inform you that, after preview by the Editorial Office and peer review as well as CrossCheck and Google plagiarism detection, we believe that the academic quality, language quality, and ethics of your manuscript (Manuscript NO.: 86646, Minireviews) basically meet the publishing requirements of the *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*. As such, we have made the preliminary decision that it is acceptable for publication after your appropriate revision.

Dear editors,

Dear reviewers,

Thank you for your time to review our paper. We acknowledge that our paper might have some issues in conformity with the referees' comments. We have addressed them and revised the manuscript accordingly. Changes are visible as highlighted and/or track changes.

We sincerely thank the three reviewers for their thorough and helpful comments and suggestions. We have addressed all of the raised queries and responded to all reviewers' comments.

We believe that you find these changes satisfactory, and the revisions have substantially improved the quality of the manuscript.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

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

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: I suggest it for major revision.

- Thank you for the overall evaluation of our paper as good
1. INTRODUCTION part is too simple.
 - Thank you for the critical point. We have extended the introduction to make it more complex. Additionally, please, consider that the overall count of words in the paper has been already 10,500, thus, we focused on the other parts of the paper.
 2. Except for COVID-19 vaccination, I suggest many other methods should be introduced. For example, these two paper, PMID, 35187617 and PMID, 36776881.
 - Thank you for the valuable suggestions. We have added the proposed papers. However, the topic of our paper is COVID-19 vaccines in patients with oncological diseases, thus, we just mention these papers and extract the most important from them.

3. Language should be edited. For example, a study by Brar et al. [15] of 585 patients, 117 of whom with active malignancies, obtained results showing that there is no statistically significant difference in morbidity or mortality in cancer patients and studies claiming the opposite did not take into account confounding factors like age, sex and comorbidities, which is arguable. Data so far showed that patients with cancer are at increased risk of developing severe COVID-19. They are not easy to be understood.

- The referee is right to point that out. We have revised the text considering grammar, style, and comprehension to improve the readability of this passage and the whole paper.

4. IMMUNE RESPONSE IN CANCER PATIENTS, I suggest authors show some information about T cells.

- Thank you for the great suggestions. We added information on T cells since they are crucial subpopulations regarding tumor immunity.

5. The challenge for COVID-19 in cancer should be added.

- Thank you for the great suggestion, we summarize the challenges in the end of the section on COVID-19 and oncological patients. This information is available from page 6 to page 10.

6. there are many individual sentences, the structure should be re-arranged.

- Thank you for the critical point. We tried to improve all of these issues, including to improve the structure of the paper.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Major Comments:

- Thank you for the overall evaluation of our paper as good

1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript.

- Thank you for the valuable and critical notes. There were not any controversies in the field. However, due to lack of data, there were some concerns regarding safety and effectiveness

of the COVID-19 vaccines in oncological patients, that were declined. The concerns regarding COVID-19 vaccines for oncology patients is covered on page 13, 15 and 17.

- We also summarized the most recent and important achievements in the field, based on your suggestion. This is visible in Table 1.
- We completely agree that answering to these questions are crucial for the comprehension and readability of the paper, thus, we tried our best efforts to emphasize on them through the paper.
- We agree that the year of publication is important, as well as the names of the investigators. We put some of the years in the text, however, since the data are recent (from the last three years during the pandemic), we limited the number of years mentioned in the text to some.

2. The discussion section is modest.

- We agree that some of our sections might be not fully covered. However, please, note that the word count is over 10,500 which made us limiting focusing on some of the secondary topics while trying to cover all the available information for the effectiveness and safety of COVID-19 vaccines in oncological patients.

3. Abstract: not properly written.

- We revised the abstract along with all the corrections and improvements of the main text.

4. Conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results.

- Thank you for the critical note. We did our best to improve the conclusion. Please, mind that our paper is a review, but not an original paper with own results.

5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning.

- Thank you for the critical note, we put more discussion on the cited papers, as well as to summarize and review and argue on the findings.

6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript.

- We agree that our paper might have some issues and we revised it thoroughly.

7. English is modest. Therefore, the authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.

- Thank you for the valuable suggestion. We revised the text and also a colleague of us proofread the manuscript once again.

Round 2

Specific Comments To Authors: Conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results.

Dear reviewer, Dear editors, Thank you for the further comments. We did our best to improve the conclusions in line with your previous comments. We have to emphasize again, that the paper type is review, thus, there is no designated results section. However, we made some correction in the main text and tried to tie the main text with a concise and clear conclusion at the end of the paper.