

## Reviewer #1

Specific Comments to Authors: Comments to the authors The article with the title “Neoadjuvant Treatment: A Window Of Opportunity For Nutritional Prehabilitation In Patients With Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma” is in generally well done, but I would offer these comments to the investigators:

The authors sincerely and gratefully thank the reviewer for the advice provided. Below we respond point by point with the corrections made in the main text:

1) Some minor grammatical errors occur. The manuscript contains significant language-related issues. Please correct these types of grammatical errors throughout the paper.

Thank you for your advice. The paper has been thoroughly and extensively reviewed according to your suggestion by an English-native speaker.

2) Several words throughout the manuscript appear to be merged. Please correct it.

We merged several words in the main text, when possible.

3) A short paragraph about the current treatment options would be useful.

A specific paragraph was added in the Introduction section, to schematize the current neoadjuvant therapeutical options for Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma.

4) A summarized table about the subsection of “NUTRITIONAL MANAGEMENT” (Protein intake, enzyme replacement etc) would be useful.

Thanks again for your comment. Table 2 was added to better summarize the specific items of the main text.

## Criteria Checklist

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Answer: YES

2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Answer: YES

3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Answer: YES

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Answer: Generally YES

5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Answer: -

6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Answer: -

7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Answer: -

8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Answer: some improvements would be useful

Table 2, summarizing the nutritional supply during NAT for PDAC, was added.

9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Answer: -

10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Answer: -

11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Answer: generally YES.

12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Answer: YES

13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting?

14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics?

(1) Science editor: 1

Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a review of the neoadjuvant treatment. The topic is within the scope of the WJGS.

(1) Classification: Grade C;

(2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The article is in generally well done. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered;

We answered, point on point, to the reviewer's questions.

(3) Format: There is 1 table and 1 figure;

(4) References: A total of 142 references are cited, including 49 references published in the last 3 years;

(5) Self-cited references: There are 5 self-cited references. The self-referencing rates should be less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations (i.e. those that are most closely related to the topic of the manuscript) and remove all other improper self-citations. If the authors fail to address the critical issue of self-citation, the editing process of this manuscript will be terminated; and

(6) References recommendations: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially references published by the peer reviewer(s) him/herself (themselves). If the authors find the peer reviewer(s) request for the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself (themselves), please send the peer reviewer's ID number to [editorialoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:editorialoffice@wjgnet.com). The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately.

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade C.

3 Academic norms and rules: No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search.

4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJGS.

5 Issues raised:

(1) The language classification is Grade C. Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies we recommend: <https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>;

Thanks again for your comment. After the author revised the paper an English native speaker, who guarantees for the grammar and English of this paper, again revised it.

(2) The "Author Contributions" section is missing. Please provide the author contributions;

Sorry for this lack. We provide this section now.

(3) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; and

Sorry for this lack. We provide now the .pptx file for the Image 1.

(4) If an author of a submission is re-using a figure or figures published elsewhere, or that is copyrighted, the author must provide documentation that the previous publisher or copyright holder has given permission for the figure to be re-published; and correctly indicating the

reference source and copyrights. For example, “Figure 1 Histopathological examination by hematoxylin-eosin staining (200 ×). A: Control group; B: Model group; C: Pioglitazone hydrochloride group; D: Chinese herbal medicine group. Citation: Yang JM, Sun Y, Wang M, Zhang XL, Zhang SJ, Gao YS, Chen L, Wu MY, Zhou L, Zhou YM, Wang Y, Zheng FJ, Li YH. Regulatory effect of a Chinese herbal medicine formula on non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. World J Gastroenterol 2019; 25(34): 5105-5119. Copyright ©The Author(s) 2019. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc[6]”. And please cite the reference source in the references list. If the author fails to properly cite the published or copyrighted picture(s) or table(s) as described above, he/she will be subject to withdrawal of the article from BPG publications and may even be held liable.

6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

(3) Company editor-in-chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office’s comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. However, the quality of the English language of the manuscript does not meet the requirements of the journal. Before final acceptance, the author(s) must provide the English Language Certificate issued by a professional English language editing company. Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies we recommend: <https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>.

Dear Editor, we completely reviewed the paper and a native-English speaker revised it again. However, we can not afford to pay the fee of a professional English language editing company, so we hope that you can consider our paper for publication if it now satisfies the reviewer’s suggestions.