

Response letter

Thank you for your constructive comments. By reading your suggestions, I have once again double-checked and refined this paper.

REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: In their manuscript, Li et al. reviewed the role of gemcitabine plus nab-paclitaxel combined with new targeted drugs in the treatment of metastatic pancreatic cancer. After inclusion of 7 RCTs in a meta-analysis for a total of 1544 patients, the Authors concluded that the addition of novel targeted agents did not result in a survival advantage for patients with advanced pancreatic cancer. This is an interesting topic, it is a comprehensive review, and the paper is well-written. There are only typos to correct and I recommend publication.

Response:

First of all, thank you very much for your comments on the article. Secondly you mentioned that there are some spelling errors in this article and I have again sent the article to a professional company for retouching to improve the language. I note that your last comment suggested priority publication but the scientific quality rating was C. This also led to the article being rejected by World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology and suggested to be forwarded to another journal under its banner. So I hope you can confirm this.

Once again, thank you for your valuable comments.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Concerning manuscript no. 76852 by Li et al. titled "Would a gemcitabine plus nab-paclitaxel work better in the treatment of metastatic pancreatic cancer if combined with a new targeted agent? a meta-analysis"- this is an important review together with a

meta analysis that permits the reader to understand whether the combination of targeted therapies with the clinically utilized gemcitabine/ nab-paclitaxel combination which the authors call “GA” will improve patient response. It is an important, well written and well thought-out manuscript that suggests that it will be necessary to discover novel targeted therapies in the future to improve PDAC therapy. There is only a small problem on page 5 of the manuscript received by me in which, probably due to typographical errors, it is not clear what the authors wanted to say- here following I have put question marks in red in the parts that are not clear: “In an Ib study evaluating the safety and tolerability of PEGPH 20 in combination with GEM, ???the results showed ??? In an Ib study evaluating the safety and tolerability of PEGPH 20 in combination with GEM for advanced pancreatic cancer. ???S indicated by the results, PEGPH 20 was well tolerated, especially in patients with high HA [12]. “ After the correction of the above cited problem, I highly recommend this manuscript for immediate publication.

Response:

First of all, thank you very much for your comments on the article. Secondly, I would like to explain to you the citation issue you mentioned. The original text in the article reads “In an Ib study evaluates the safety and tolerability of PEGPH 20 in combination with Gemcitabine for advanced pancreatic cancer. Having been indicated by the results, PEGPH 20 was well tolerated, especially in patients with high hyaluronic acid.” Metastatic pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma is characterized by excessive HA accumulation in the tumor microenvironment, elevating interstitial pressure and impairing perfusion. Preclinical studies demonstrated PEGPH20 degrades HA, thereby increasing drug delivery. I hope you have understood the problem with the citation here.

Once again, thank you for your valuable comments.

EDITORIAL OFFICE’S COMMENTS

This is a meta-analysis in which author reviewed the role of gemcitabine plus nab-paclitaxel combined with new targeted drugs in the treatment of metastatic pancreatic cancer. Authors concluded that the addition of novel targeted agents did not result in a survival advantage for patients with advanced pancreatic cancer. This paper is well written. Figure legends should be rewritten with more details. Authors are strongly recommended to consult with a professional English language editing company to further polish the paper.

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Response:

Thank you for your constructive comments. We have revised it accordingly as following:

1. I have revised the charts in the article and tried to make them editable, but due to the special nature of this article, some forest charts are automatically generated by the analysis software and cannot be modified, I hope you understand.
2. I have again sent the article to a professional company for touch-ups to improve the language level of the article.