

Name of the journal: **World Journal of Clinical Cases**

*Mirchev et al.* Synchronous manifestation of colorectal cancer and intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasms

Dear Editor,

Dear Reviewers,

Thank you for your time to revise our Number ID: 05432804, **Synchronous manifestation of colorectal cancer and intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasms**, Authors: Milko Mirchev, Irina Boeva, Monika Peshevska-Sekulovska, Veselin Stoitsov, Milena Peruhova. We have incorporated most of the suggestions made by the reviewers. Those changes are highlighted within the manuscript. Please see below, in red, for a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments. All page numbers refer to the revised manuscript file with tracked changes.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

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

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Major Comments: 1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, the novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript.

2. The results and discussion section is very weak and no emphasis is given on the discussion of the results like why certain effects are coming into existence and what could be the possible reason behind them.

Thank you for your valuable comments. We added a new discussion of the results.

3. Conclusion: not properly written. 4. Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results.

The referee is absolutely right to point this out. Thus, we have modified the conclusion part.

5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature.

We have rearranged the discussion part and added some relevant new data concerning the manuscript.

6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript. 7. English is modest. Therefore, the authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers. Response to Reviewer 1

Thank you for your comment. We will send the revised manuscript to a professional English language editing company to polish the manuscript.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** It is a review that examines the relationship between IPMN and CRC from various angles, and has interesting content. Write down what needs to be improved.

1. The introduction should clearly explain why the relationship between IPMN and CRC was considered. The "Relevant data concerning the association between IPMN

and CRC" part that appears at the end of the paper should be brought to the front, about next to the introduction.

Thank you for your suggestion. However, we consider that it would change the whole structure of our manuscript.

2. IPMN is sometimes mistaken for IMPN. Please check the details again.

Thank you for your valuable notes. We have corrected our mistakes.

## The second Round Review

Specific Comments To Authors: Major Comments: 1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript. 2. The results and discussion section is very weak and no emphasis is given on the discussion of the results like why certain effects are coming in to existence and what could be the possible reason behind them? 3. Conclusion: not properly written. 4. Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results. 5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature. 6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript. 7. English is modest. Therefore, the authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.

### Response:

Dear Editor, Thank you for your e-mail. I would like to give you short answers regarding your comments. Specific Comments To Authors: Major Comments: 1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript. 2. The results and discussion section is very weak and no emphasis is given on the discussion of the results like why certain effects are coming in to existence and what could be the possible reason behind them? 3. Conclusion: not properly written. 4. Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results. 5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature. 6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript. 7. English is modest. Therefore, the authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers. We have answered all these comments of the reviewers and made all the changes in the revised manuscript. In general, we rearrange the discussion part and added some relevant new data concerning the manuscript. We totally modify the conclusion part of the manuscript. In reference to the quality of English, we send the manuscript to a professional language editing company to polish the

manuscript. I am at your disposal for further questions. Best Regards! Milena Peruhova, MD  
Corresponding author Gastroenterology Department Heart and Brain Hospital Bulgaria, Burgas