

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript entitled “*The Role of Imaging in Evaluating the Response After Neoadjuvant Treatment for Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma*” (World Journal of Gastroenterology Manuscript NO: 63283). The comments are valuable, inspiring, and constructive for our work. We have studied reviewer’s comments carefully and made modifications in accordance with the reviewers’ comments which we hope can meet with your approval. Changes made from the previous article file were tracked in the revised manuscript (in red).

The point-by-point response letter has been presented below and mentioned the changes made to the original manuscript (in bold).

We greatly appreciate for both your help and that of other reviewers’ comments. We have carefully revised our manuscript according to the comments. All authors have read and approved the final revised version. We hope that the revised manuscript can go with your expectation for publication in World Journal of Gastroenterology.

Best regards,

Bin Song

Response to reviewer

To Reviewer #1:

1. This may only apply to pancreatic adenocarcinoma.

Author's response:

Thanks for your advice. We have changed the word 'Pancreatic Cancer (PC)' to 'Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma (PDAC)' throughout the manuscript.

2. It should be mentioned or addressed that with the advancement of technology, EUS has been widely used for this purpose. IT is understandable that the authors are focused on Imaging studies, but it will generate confusion if the EUS for the same purpose was not acknowledged.

Author's response:

We appreciate the reviewer's comment. We have added the contents about the role of Endoscopic Ultrasound (EUS) in the tumor response evaluation of PDAC after neoadjuvant treatment (NAT), as well as its advantages and limitations. (See **RESPONSE ASSESSMENT OF PDAC AFTER NAT section, line 1~31, Page 10; and MERITS AND SHORTCOMINGS OF CURRENT IMAGING IN NAT RESPONSE FOR PDAC section, line 3~7, Page 23; and Table 1**)

3. The introduction should be shortened to make it concise and purpose driving.

Author's response:

Thanks a lot for this helpful advice. The INTRODUCTION has been shortened to make it more concise and purpose driving. (See **line 1~16, Page 5**)

4. *The conclusion should be edited/modified.*

Author's response:

We appreciate the reviewer's comment. We have revised the CONCLUSION section. (*See line 19~20, Page 24 and line1~9, Page 25*)

List of actions:

1. We have changed the word 'Pancreatic Cancer (PC)' to 'Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma (PDAC)' in this article.
2. We have added the contents about the role of Endoscopic Ultrasound (EUS) in the tumor response evaluation of PDAC after neoadjuvant treatment (NAT), as well as its advantages and limitations.
3. The INTRODUCTION has been shortened to make it more concise and purpose driving.
4. The CONCLUSION has been modified.

Other changes:

Besides, we have also made corresponding changes in **figure 1** (changed pancreatic cancer (PC) to pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC). In addition, we have added some related references (*See references no.30~35*). Finally, we have added the Core Tip section according to the editor's suggestion.