

PEER-REVIEW REPORT**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology***Manuscript NO:** 88296**Title:** Identification of exhaled breath volatile organic compounds to distinguish between pancreatic adenocarcinoma, pancreatic cystic neoplasm, and patients without pancreatic lesions**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed**Peer-review model:** Single blind**Reviewer's code:** 03674268**Position:** Editorial Board**Academic degree:** MD, PhD**Professional title:** Chief Doctor, Professor**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China**Author's Country/Territory:** Thailand**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-09-22**Reviewer chosen by:** Yu-Lu Chen**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-11-02 06:40**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-11-02 07:07**Review time:** 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty

Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	☐ Grade A: Excellent ☒ Grade B: Good ☐ Grade C: Fair ☐ Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	☐ Grade A: Excellent ☒ Grade B: Good ☐ Grade C: Fair ☐ Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	☐ Grade A: Priority publishing ☒ Grade B: Minor language polishing ☐ Grade C: A great deal of language polishing ☐ Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	☐ Accept (High priority) ☐ Accept (General priority) ☐ Minor revision ☒ Major revision ☐ Rejection
Re-review	☒ Yes ☐ No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: ☒ Anonymous ☐ Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: ☒ Yes ☐ No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors aimed to identify exhaled breath volatile organic compounds to diagnose PDAC. They compared the VOCs between patients with PDAC and patients with IPMN or healthy individuals. They found two VOCs, dimethyl sulfide and acetone dimer, were higher expressed in PDAC patients than those in control groups. Then the two VOCs seemed to be good biomarkers with high AUCs. Overall, the study was well organized and well written. Here are also some shortcomings: 1. VOCs in PDAC have been explored by previous studies (e.g., Br J Surg 2018, BMC cancer 2018). How about the difference between current study and previous ones? 2. How about the specificity in disguising PDACs from other ampullary cancers? Sometimes it is hard to do using imaging. However, the acetone dimer level in human secretions have been reported to be higher in a variety of digestive cancers. It seems to be a common biomarker in digestive cancers. 3. Regarding IPMN, it is important to distinguish the malignant one

from benign ones. Could VOCs do it? How many PDACs were from IPMN in the current study? 4. Other benign pancreatic tumors should be included. 5. Any prognostic value of VOCs? 6. The authors have claimed in the limitation part that there was no external validation. But internal validation could be done.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 88296

Title: Identification of exhaled breath volatile organic compounds to distinguish between pancreatic adenocarcinoma, pancreatic cystic neoplasm, and patients without pancreatic lesions

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05251368

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DNB, FACS, MBBS, MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Thailand

Manuscript submission date: 2023-09-22

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-17 11:53

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-28 15:34

Review time: 11 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	☐ Grade A: Excellent ☐ Grade B: Very good ☒ Grade C: Good ☐ Grade D: Fair ☐ Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	☐ Grade A: Excellent ☒ Grade B: Good ☐ Grade C: Fair ☐ Grade D: No novelty

Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	☐ Grade A: Excellent ☒ Grade B: Good ☐ Grade C: Fair ☐ Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	☐ Grade A: Excellent ☒ Grade B: Good ☐ Grade C: Fair ☐ Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	☐ Grade A: Priority publishing ☒ Grade B: Minor language polishing ☐ Grade C: A great deal of language polishing ☐ Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	☐ Accept (High priority) ☒ Accept (General priority) ☐ Minor revision ☐ Major revision ☐ Rejection
Re-review	☒ Yes ☐ No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: ☒ Anonymous ☐ Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: ☐ Yes ☒ No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Useful study. However needs more data to validate the findings.