

Reviewer Assessment

R. Jimbo et al.: Cohort Study of the Overall Survival of patients with pancreatic cancer in a Hospital of Specialties of Quito-Ecuador in the period 2007 to 2017

Reviewers' Comments to Original Submission

Reviewer 1: Probst, Pascal

Date received: 01-Dec-2020

Reviewer recommendation: **Return to author for minor modifications**

Reviewer overall scoring: **Medium**

Assessment Form scores: 5 = High/Yes; 3 = Medium/Adequate; 1 = Low

Is the subject area appropriate for the journal			3		
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	5				
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content		4			
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?		4			
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?		4			
Are the results/ conclusions justified?		4			
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?		4			
How adequate is the data presentation?			3		
Are units and terminology used correctly?		4			
Is the number of cases adequate?	5				
Are the experimental methods/ clinical studies adequate?		4			
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?		4			
Does the reader get new insights from the article?		4			
Please rate the practical significance.		4			
Please rate the accuracy of methods.		4			
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.		4			
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.		4			
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.		4			
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.		4			
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.		4			
Are the methods used worthy of reproduction in greater deal?	No				
Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?	Yes				

Comments to author: A retrospective analysis of patients with pancreatic cancer from Ecuador is presented. Such data are important for comparison of outcomes between countries. I have some minor concerns to be addressed:

Please define "later stages" or do you just mean stage IV?

Please tell us how many % of patients underwent surgery in curative attempt.

Please label the time axis in the KM-curves with, I assume, days.

Please calculate Hazard ratios in a way that longer Survival has a HR above 1

Reviewer 2: anonymous

Date received: 10-Dec-2021

Reviewer recommendation: **Return to author for minor modifications**

Reviewer overall scoring: **High**

Assessment Form scores: 5 = High/Yes; 3 = Medium/Adequate; 1 = Low

Is the subject area appropriate for the journal	5				
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	5				
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content	5				
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	5				
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?			3		
Are the results/ conclusions justified?		4			
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?		4			
How adequate is the data presentation?		4			
Are units and terminology used correctly?	5				
Is the number of cases adequate?	5				
Are the experimental methods/ clinical studies adequate?		4			
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?		4			
Does the reader get new insights from the article?			3		
Please rate the practical significance.			3		
Please rate the accuracy of methods.		4			
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.		4			
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.		4			
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.		4			
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.			3		
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.		4			
Are the methods used worthy of reproduction in greater deal?					
Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?	No				

Comments to author: I would like to congratulate the authors for this nice and precise manuscript. We do not know much about pancreatic Cancer in South America, and therefore this paper adds relevant Information. The data show, that the overall survival is extremely poor. With this respect it would be interesting to know: what is the survival following R0-resection versus R1/R2-resection? The authors should provide these data. Additionally, the paper should be revised by a native English speaker to improve language.

Authors' Response to Reviewer Comments

Date received: 09-Sep-2020

Response to reviewer 1

Please define "later stages" or do you just mean stage IV?

Reply: we account stages III and IV that represented 15,1 % and 54,6% respectively, as late stages for pancreatic neoplasm. This change is included in lines 18, 1076-109

Please tell us how many % of patients underwent surgery in curative attempt.

Reply: 32,4 % patients received surgical treatment, in this group 27,17% had surgery alone and 11,2% had surgery plus another treatment. This change is included in lines 109-111.

Please label the time axis in the KM-curves with, I assume, days.

Reply: Thanks for the recommendation we changed the graphics.

Please calculate Hazard ratios in a way that longer Survival has a HR above 1

Reply: As explained in the book "Basic Biostatistics for Medical and Biomedical Practitioners" 2019 by Julien I.E. Hoffman: "If the hazard ratio is > 1 , it indicates that the treatment group has a shorter survival than the control referenced group, and if it is < 1 , it indicates that the group of interest is less likely to have a shorter time to the event than the reference group. The ratio does not quantify the magnitude of the difference."

The editor is asking us to change the direction of the interpretation of Hazard Ratio, which is unclear to us, considering that the Hazard Ratio is a measure of Risk.

Response to reviewer 2

Comments to the Author

What is the survival following R0-resection versus R1/R2-resection?

Reply: This variable was not collected in our study. If you think that it is an important variable, we can collect it but we may take a few days to do so.

Additionally, the paper should be revised by a native English speaker to improve language.

Reply: A language review has been performed

Reviewers' Comments to Revised Submission

Reviewer 1: Probst, Pascal

Date received: 11-Jan-2021

Reviewer recommendation: **Accept in present form**

Reviewer overall scoring: **High**

Assessment Form scores: 5 = High/Yes; 3 = Medium/Adequate; 1 = Low

Is the subject area appropriate for the journal	5				
---	---	--	--	--	--

Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	5				
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content	5				
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	5				
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?					
Are the results/ conclusions justified?	5				
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?	5				
How adequate is the data presentation?	5				
Are units and terminology used correctly?	5				
Is the number of cases adequate?	5				
Are the experimental methods/ clinical studies adequate?	5				
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?	5				
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	5				
Please rate the practical significance.	5				
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	5				
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	5				
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	5				
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	5				
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	5				
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.					
Are the methods used worthy of reproduction in greater deal?	No				
Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?	Yes				

Comments to author: All queries were resolved.

Comments by the Editor-in-Chief to Revised Submission

Since the first reviewer rated the revised manuscript "5" and all queries were adequately dealt with, I accept the revised manuscript.