

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/gs-22-753>

Review comments-Reviewer A

Comment 1: First, the title should be the clinical characteristics of CC and the development and validation of its CSS prediction nomogram

Reply 1: Thank you very much. We revised the title as follows:

Changes in the text: The clinical characteristics of pancreatic colloid carcinoma and the development and validation of its cancer-specific survival prediction nomogram (see Page 1, line 2-3)

Comment 2: Second, the abstract is not standardized and needs further revisions. The background did not indicate what the knowledge gaps are on the clinical characteristics of CC and its prognosis prediction models and what the clinical needs for the two research focuses are. The methods did not describe the inclusion of subjects, the assessment of clinical characteristics, follow up, generation of training and validation samples, and measurements of prognosis outcomes. The results need to first report the 1-, 3-, and 5-year CSS rates and the clinical characteristics of the study sample. It is also necessary to provide the AUC values of the prediction model in both the training and validation samples. The conclusion needs detailed comments for the clinical implications of the findings.

Reply 2: Thanks for your constructive suggestion! We have carefully revised the abstract according to your suggestion.

Changes in the text: We have modified our abstract as advised (background: see Page 1, line 30-35; methods: see Page 2, line 36-45; results: see Page 2, line 46-56; conclusions: see Page 2, line 57-59).

Comment 3: Third, in the introduction of the main text, the authors need to describe the clinical needs for the data on the clinical characteristics and prognosis of CC and its prognosis prediction model. Please review what has been known on the clinical characteristics and prognosis of CC and its prognostic factors and analyze the limitations and knowledge gaps of prior studies including case reports.

Reply 3: Thanks for your kind reminders. As reviewers advised, we performed revision in the introduction.

Changes in the text: The clinical characteristics of CC were described in Page 3, line 96-99. The prognosis of CC was described in Page 4, line 101-104. The prognosis prediction model of CC was described in Page 4, line 114-117. The limitations and knowledge gaps of prior studies were described in Page 4, line 106-111.

Comment 4: Fourth, in the methodology of the main text, please describe the details of follow up of the SEER data. In statistics, when comparing the prognosis between CC and DAC, please consider multiple regression analysis to adjust for potential confounders.

Reply 4: Thanks for your constructive suggestion. We have detailed the follow up of the SEER data and the statistics mentioned above.

Changes in the text: As advised, we stated the key element of the follow up of the SEER data (see Page 4, line 128-133). For statistics, comparing the prognosis between CC and DAC was not the focus of this study. The statistical methods used in this study can also achieve the purpose, so multiple regression analysis was not be used.

Review comments-Reviewer B

Comment 1: The introduction section should be shortened. There are many sentences introducing the background of CC, which is irrelevant to this study.

Reply 1: Thanks for your advice! We have shorted the introduction section.

Changes in the text: See page 4, line 107-108; line 115-119 (Labeled version).

Comment 2 and Comment 3: Tables 1, 2 and 3 are not cited in the main text. All figures and tables are not cited in the main text.

Reply 2 and 3: Thanks for your comments! We have re-cited all the tables and figures.

Changes in the text: Table 1 see page 7, line 207; Table 2 see page 8, line 236; Table 3 see page 8, line 238; Figure 1 see page 5, line 144; Figure 2 see page 7, line 227; Figure 3 see page 8, line 254; Figure 4 see page 8, line 262; Figure 5 see page 8, line 263; Figure 6A see page 8, line 265; Figure 6B see page 9, line 275.

Comment 4: Discussion: the first paragraph is redundant and should be removed or incorporated in the introduction section.

Reply 4: Thanks for your advice! We have removed the first paragraph of the discussion and partially revised the introduction.

Changes in the text: The revised introduction section is on page 3, line 93-96.

“A separate subtype of DAC, known as pancreatic CC, differs histologically and clinically from common DAC. Histologically, CC is featured by clusters of neoplastic cells that make up at least 50% of the tumor and float in extracellular stromal mucin lakes.”

Comment 5: Line 343, “logical” should be revised as Cox

Reply 5: Thanks for your advice! The “logical” has revised as “Cox”.

Changes in the text: See Page 10, line 325.

Comment 6: Lines 387 to 409: Are these previous findings relevant to your study? If these findings support your work, please specify.

Reply 6: Thanks for your comments! These findings are relevant to our study. Findings (32-34) showed surgery was the preferred treatment for pancreatic cancer and pancreatic cancer patients will experience local recurrence or distant metastases following surgery. Finding 35 showed the necessity of adjuvant chemotherapy after surgery. Finding 36 revealed preoperative chemotherapy was significantly correlated with enhanced median overall survival in DAC patients. Finding 37 and 38 showed low R1 resection had a negative impact on survival. Finding 9 showed a patient with a 15-cm locally-invasive pancreatic colloid carcinoma tumor remained asymptomatic and had a good quality of life 24 months after surgery. Finding 39 showed the benefit of surgery on tumor bleeding. Finding 6 revealed the success rate of surgical resection of CC. Finding 40 revealed adjuvant chemoradiotherapy was found to be effective in patients with node-positive CC.

Changes in the text: None.

Comment 7: The discussion section is too long, and there are some redundant sentences.

Reply 7: Thanks for your advice! We have shorted the discussion.

Changes in the text: See page 9-12, line 281-412: discussion section.

Comment 8: Basic clinical information and survival analysis: The baseline characteristics of the participants have been summarized in Table 1. However, the authors restate table 1 in their main text. This content should be shortened to make the results section concise and clear.

Reply 8: Thanks for your advice! We have shorted the results.

Changes in the text: See page 7, line 206-225.

Comment 9: Lines 262 to 267, this sentence should be deleted.

Reply 9: Thanks for your advice! We have deleted this sentence.

Changes in the text: See page 8, line 262-267.

Comment 10: Although this is an interesting and valuable work, the readability of the manuscript needs to be improved.

Reply 10: Thanks for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript. Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval.

Review comments-Reviewer C

Comment 1: Please define HR and CI in Abstract.

Reply: Thanks for your constructive suggestion and emendation!

Changes in the text: The defined HR and CI were described in Page 2, line 48.

Comment 2: There're two references lists included in your paper, please just keep one final version.

Reply: Thanks for your advice! We have kept one references version.

Changes in the text: See Page 15, line 490.

Comment 3: Figure 1: Please check all those numbers, they are all incorrect. For example, 128335-110177=18158.

Reply: Thanks for your advice! We have revised the Figure 1.

Changes in the text: See supplementary file.

Comment 3: Figure 2: Please add units for X-axis in the figure.

Reply: Thanks for your advice! We have added units for X-axis in the figure 2.

Changes in the text: Figure 2 revised and send the revised figure as separate files in JPG.

Comment 4: Figure 6B: Please add units for X-axis in the figure.

Reply: Thanks for your advice! We have added units for X-axis in the figure 6B.

Changes in the text: Figure 6B revised and send the revised figure as separate files in JPG.

Comment 5: Please define all abbreviations in Table 3 footnote.

Reply: Thanks for your kind reminders. We have added abbreviations in Table 3

Changes in the text: See page 29, line 664.