

Date: 09-14-2022

To,

BPG Editor,

World Journal of Gastroenterology.

Subject: Resubmit manuscript " Pancreatic Acinar Cell Carcinoma: A Comprehensive Review." **Manuscript NO:** 79372

Respected,

The authors, thank you for the opportunity to resubmit the manuscript. We have revised the manuscript as per the reviewer's comments, as also explained below. We hope you consider our work for publication.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,
Corresponding Author.

Reviewer #1:

1. First, this manuscript provides an extended and comprehensive review of a relevant and poorly researched topic in pancreatic oncology - Pancreatic Acinar Cell Carcinoma. Overall, it has a good quality in terms of organization and presentation.

Reply: Thank you for the comment.

2. However, some details are worth noting, namely the uniform use of abbreviations [e.g. – p11 (highlighted in bold) – “Solid pseudopapillary neoplasms (SPNs) manifest as large, voluminous pancreatic masses that are clinically comparable to ACC; (...) Typically, SPTs exhibit nuclear immunoreactivity for β -catenin and strong expression of CD10, (...)”; or in p12 the abbreviation of Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinomas, PDACs, should be presented earlier (highlighted in bold) - “ACCs typically lack the characteristic cytomorphologic features of Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinomas (PDACs), allowing these two tumors to be distinguished easily. PDACs typically exhibit "drunk honeycomb".]

Reply: Thank you for the comments. We have corrected the use of abbreviations to be uniform.

3. Second, illustrations and tables are appropriate, of good quality and fit the paper contents.

Reply: Thank you for the comment.

4. Nevertheless, some results reported should be checked, as those presented on table 5 - Matos et al. (2009) - ACC Sample size – total – 17; sum of n° of patients (Resection – 12 + Mixed CHT – 4 + Mixed CRT – 2 = 18), or Seo et al. (2009) - ACC Sample size

– total – 20; sum of n° of patients (Resection – 10 + R & 5FU – 9 + R & Gen – 1 + R & Eto/Cis – 1 = 21).

Reply: Thank you for the comment. We have checked all the numbers on the table and corrected them. Some studies do not report the treatment for a great portion of the sample. For those that are not mentioned, they will be categorized as “other treatment.”

5. Third, the manuscript highlights the key points of the review concisely and reasonably, presenting in a proper manner, its relevance and usefulness to daily clinical practice. In this regard, the conclusion appropriately summarizes the evidence that this comprehensive review provided.

Reply: Thank you for the comment.

6. Finally, as a suggestion in terms of future directions of the topic, a systematic review should be conducted, and if possible, a metanalysis of the main results/outcomes.

Reply: Thank you for the comment. Your comments are very helpful.

Reviewer #2:

1. BCL-10 was useful to diagnosis for acinar cell carcinoma (ACC). In “Immunohistochemistry” section, you described about BCL-10 only in the table, and you should mention it in the manuscript.

Reply: Thank you for the comment. We have added the manuscript information on BCL-10 protein in concordance with the table.

2. In “Staging for Acinar Pancreatic Carcinoma” section, you mentioned about the AJCC staging and showed Table and Figures. However, I could not catch up what you want to say or emphasize. Where there any relationship between staging and prognosis. Please revise manuscript and Figures to understand what you want to say.

Reply: Thank you for the comment. We have added a sentence to emphasize the meaning of the table and figures.

3. In Figure 1, the magnification was too low to distinguish these patterns. You should revise these Figure using appropriate magnification.

Reply: Thank you for the comment. We have corrected the magnification for figure 1.

4. In “Radiological Features” section, ACC had characteristics of extension along the inside of MPD, you should describe it with appropriate references.

Reply: Thank you for the comment. We have added the appropriate references of the described study.

Reviewer #3:

1. The review article seems to be an informative one with a lot of significant information regarding Pancreatic Acinar Cell Carcinoma. This article would be useful for the readers of the journal. Hence, I suggest the manuscript be accepted.

Reply: Thank you very much for the comment.