

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 71963

Title: Pancreatic head versus pancreatic body/tail cancer: are they different?

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05048160

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-30 08:00

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-01 08:43

Review time: 1 Day

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very nice retrospective study comparing PDAC that have arisen from two different parts of the pancreas. It is well organized and the data well presented. There is need of only a careful correction of English as it is a bit stilted in some parts and this makes the reading not a smooth as it could be. I would like to see the discussion about why their data suggests that Gemcitabine treatment would be better in tumors arising from the PBTC rather than the PHC. Also, lease explain better why the SMAD mutations were not statistically significant while those of p53 were. Probably due to very large variation in the data even if SMAD was mutated 3 times higher in the PHC. Otherwise, it is fine as it is and can be published after those English corrections and maybe the explanations of the data and conclusions.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 71963

Title: Pancreatic head versus pancreatic body/tail cancer: are they different?

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05469314

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-30 16:08

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-02 12:36

Review time: 1 Day and 20 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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting retrospective analysis to explore the impact of pancreatic tumor location on presentations and molecular profiles of the patients. The following problem need to be improved. 1. As a retrospective analysis, the size of the cohort was limited. 2. Please specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the case. 3. More clinical parameters need to be added, including differentiation level, family history, smoking status, CA199 level, molecular typing, etc. 4. In Response to Chemotherapy, the post-treatment evaluation of CR, PR, SD and PD after chemotherapy should be introduced.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 71963

Title: Pancreatic head versus pancreatic body/tail cancer: are they different?

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02941357

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Netherlands

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-30 17:49

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-10 14:48

Review time: 9 Days and 20 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

With pleasure, I reviewed the article entitled: "Pancreatic head versus pancreatic body/tail cancer: are they different?" by the authors Kai Sun et al. The authors present a retrospective genetic analysis in which pancreatic head tumours and pancreatic body/tail tumours are compared. This is an interesting topic and genetic analysis will certainly be explored further in the future. The manuscript is well-written and the authors need to be acknowledged for all the work. I also have some comments. 1. The number of patients in which genetic analysis is performed ultimately is relatively small. Furthermore, the analysis is done on several tissues. It is unclear how patients were selected and it makes it difficult to making to translate these findings to clinical practice. The authors should provide somewhat more information on this. Also, more information is needed on differences in genetic analysis is various tissues 2. The Material and Methods section is succinct, but also lacks important information. What were eligibility criteria? Information on how data was collected, informed consent of the patients etc should be included. Also data on chemotherapy schemes etc would be insightful Minor comments 1. The title should be more specific. 2. Are the differences in survival corrected for stage?

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 71963

Title: Pancreatic head vs pancreatic body/tail cancer: Are they different?

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02941357

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Netherlands

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-29

Reviewer chosen by: Yun-Xiaojuan Wu

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-13 19:09

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-13 19:22

Review time: 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, thank you for answering the comments made. I agree with the additions and have no further comments