

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

**Manuscript NO:** 78317

**Title:** Neoadjuvant Therapy in Resectable Pancreatic Cancer: A Promising Curative Method to Improve the Prognosis

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04053439

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-06-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-07-01 10:52

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-07-11 12:24

**Review time:** 10 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Zhang and colleagues performed a review investigating the role of neoadjuvant therapy in randomized clinical trials including resectable pancreatic cancer. However, the aim of this manuscript is not clearly declared. In the abstract the authors define it a meta-analysis, but the paper could only meet the criteria for a narrative review. The type of article must be specified. Background - I think that a precise definition of resectability according to the main guidelines could be useful and could be added. Studies about NAT in R-PA - The title should be changed in a plural form - Long term results of the PREOPANC trial have been recently published and must be updated.

- Page 3. It is stated that the median OS appeared to be better in the NAT group. This could not be stated since this is not a meta-analysis. The subsequent results that are reported for the single studies should include the p value.
- The final sentence section is not clear and must be reformulated.
- 2.1 - It is not reported the edition number of the AJCC TNM

Concluding remarks In the final discussion it should be highlighted the importance of selecting patients that could mostly benefit from neoadjuvant therapy. A recent review examining putative predictive factors for neoadjuvant therapy in resectable pancreatic cancer has been published (10.3389/fsurg.2022.866173).

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

**Manuscript NO:** 78317

**Title:** Neoadjuvant Therapy in Resectable Pancreatic Cancer: A Promising Curative Method to Improve the Prognosis

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06100005

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-06-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-06-26 12:33

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-07-13 01:04

**Review time:** 16 Days and 12 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall, this was a fantastic publication and a great read. Congratulations on your hard work! A few minor suggestions below. Background: Consider “which would preclude surgical resection” instead of “which leads to the loss of the chance of surgery”.

Factors about local recurrence: Tumoral diameter Consider “ Four of 19 (21%) patients in arm B were pT1-2 while only 2 of 23 (9%) of patients in arm A were this stage” instead of “Four of 19 (21%) patients in arm B were in the pT1-2 stage, while only 2 of 23 (9%) patients in arm A were in this stage.” Resection margins Consider “(17/33)” instead of “(17-33)” Table 2 comments: This table is unclear and could use a little more explanation as to what these trials are investigating. Place trial name above NCT number. For example, trial 1 is ICI20-00047 and trial 2 is CISPD-1, while trial 3 is A021806 and trial 4 is the most recognizable name: PREOPANC-3. Describe the phase of each trial. Be a little more specific on treatment arms. For example, trial 1 is investigating Surgery with or without neoadjuvant FOLFIRINOX and SBRT, trial 2 is investigating surgery with or without either neoadjuvant nPt/GEM or mFOLFIRINOX before surgery, and trial 3 is investigating Perioperative vs. adjuvant mFOLFIRINOX, and trial 4 (PREOPANC-3) is investigating perioperative vs. adjuvant mFOLFIRINOX. Are NCT01521702 and NCT01314027 the same trial? Both are called NEOPAC and are investigating the same regimen. Again, congratulations on this work! It was a great read. Thank you.