



April 30th, 2020

Dear editor,

Thank you very much for your comments. They certainly gave us some inputs for improvement.

We enclosed the revised article *"One size does not fit all for pancreatic cancers: a review on rare histologies and therapeutic approaches"*, to continue the process for submission to WJGO.

As requested, here are our point-to point response to the issues raised in the peer-review report(s).

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: This article systematically introduces some rare subtypes of pancreatic cancer, such as acinar cell carcinoma, undifferentiated carcinoma and pseudopapillary tumour, etc. It mainly introduces these rare subtypes of Epidemiology and prognosis, Pathology and molecular biology, Imaging and Treatment. These summarizing materials will help readers understand the histological features of pancreatic cancer more clearly, which is helpful for precise clinical practice. The title of this review is eye-catching, and the body part of the description is closely centered on the topic. The argument is sufficient and combines the latest frontier knowledge of pancreatic cancer. It is a good review for reading.

Thank you very much for your comments, we really appreciate them. We sincerely hope that this review will be a tool to helps clinicians in their everyday clinical practice.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: it is an interesting well written and documented manuscript



Thank you very much for this comment

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The authors reviewed rare types of pancreatic cancer, such as acinar cell carcinoma. This review covered etiology, pathology, and treatment of each rare pancreatic cancer. The manuscript was informative, and would be useful for daily clinical practice.

Thank you very much for your good review. We tried to cover all the information that could be useful for real-life clinical practice.

Step 6: Editorial Office's comments

The author must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which listed below:

- (1) **Science Editor:** Recommend for potential acceptance. 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript is a review on rare histologies and therapeutic approaches of pancreatic cancers. The topic is within the scope of the WJGO. (1) Classification: 3B. (2) Summary of the peer-review report: The reviewer#03656586 thought it is a good review for reading, the argument is sufficient and combines the latest frontier knowledge of pancreatic cancer. The reviewer#00068723 thought the review was informative, and would be useful for daily clinical practice. (3) Format: 1 Table and 1 Figure. 129 references were cited, including 32 references published in the last three years. No self-citation. 2 Language evaluation: 3B. Language was professionally edited by an English native speaker. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors' signatures of copyright license agreement did not match the all author list in the system. The authors signed the conflict-of-interest disclosure form. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck investigation and the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: (1) Invited manuscript. (2) Without financial support. (3) The topic has not been published in the WJGO.(Han Zhang)



Science Editor:

thank you for your comments. We are glad to know that you consider or work within the scope of WJGO. As far as the authors are concerned, we actually noticed that two of the authors, listed in the manuscript, do not appear in your list of authors. As already agreed via email, we ask to add them while sending our revised manuscript. The correct author list, as it is in the manuscript, is copied below. The two missing authors are written in bold.

“Monica Niger¹, Michele Prisciandaro¹, Maria Antista¹, **Melissa Anna Teresa Monica²**, **Laura Cattaneo²**, Natalie Prinzi¹, Sara Manglaviti¹, Federico Nichetti¹, Marta Brambilla¹, Martina Torchio¹, Francesca Corti¹, Sara Pusceddu¹, Jorgelina Coppa³, Vincenzo Mazzaferro^{3,4}, Filippo de Braud^{1,4} and Maria Di Bartolomeo¹

1 Medical Oncology Department, Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale dei Tumori,

2 First Pathology Division, Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale dei Tumori

3 Hepato-biliary-pancreatic Surgery and Liver Transplantation Department, Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale dei Tumori

4 Università degli studi di Milano”

(2) Editorial Office Director: 1 Scientific quality: I have checked the comments made by the science editor, and I basically agree with the science editor. The topic of the paper is within the scope of the WJGO. (1) Classification: Three Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: Reviewer 00068723 summarized that the manuscript was informative, and would be useful for daily clinical practice. Reviewer 00004011 thought that this manuscript is an interesting well written and documented manuscript. Reviewer 03656586 thought that this is a good review for reading; and (3) Format: I have checked the manuscript, and I agree with the science editor. 2 Language evaluation: I agree with the comments made by the science editor. A language editing certificate issued by an English native speaker was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: I have checked the documents, including the Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form, and Copyright License Agreement, all of which are qualified. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for this study. 5 Issues raised: (1) I found that the figures can't be edited. Please provide the original figure documents. **All submitted figures, including the text contained within the figures, must be editable.**



Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; (2) I found the PMID and DOI numbers are missing in some of the references. Please provide the PubMed and DOI numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout. 6 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

Thank you very much for all your comments. We are happy that our work respects your scientific quality. We checked all the references and now all DOI and PMID data are updated according to your suggestion, when available. Furthermore, we verified that all authors are listed for each reference and finally we rebuilt the image in powerpoint format as requested.

(2) Company Editor-in-Chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted with major revisions. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Thank you very much. We updated the manuscript according to your suggestions.

Please don't hesitate to contact me should you need anything else regarding this submission.

Best regards,

Maria Di Bartolomeo, MD

Medical Oncology Department,

Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale dei Tumori,

Via Giacomo Venezian 1, 20133 Milan Italy.

maria.dibartolomeo@istitutotumori.mi.it