Response to the Editors’ and Reviewers’ comments

Dear Editors and Reviewers,

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers’ comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Recent Advances in Treatment of Nodal and Gastrointestinal Follicular Lymphoma” (85137).

Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving my paper, as well as the important guiding significance to me. We have considered the comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Revised parts are marked in red in the revised manuscript.

The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the editor’s and reviewer’s comments are as the followings.

Responds to the editor’s comments:

1. Editor’s comments: “I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, the relevant ethics documents, and the English Language Certificate, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, 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. Please authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the Reference Citation Analysis (RCA). RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/.”

Response: Thank you so much for your precise and warm comments. I have changed the
tables into standard three-line tables, and I conformed the contents of each cell in the tables to the editing specifications. I checked the latest highlight articles on the treatment of gastrointestinal follicular lymphoma, however, I could not find the additional citation and references at present, and I will do the best for further improvement of the manuscript in the future. Thank you so much again.

Responds to the reviewer’s comments:

Reviewer #1:

1. **Reviewer’s comment:** “This review main discuss the recent treatment advance in nodular and gastroenterological follicular lymphoma (FL) and it is an interesting report.”
   
   **#Response:** Thank you so much for your overall positive estimation for the submitted manuscript.

2. **Reviewer’s comment:** “However, some important issues need to be addressed. 1. This review aimed to discuss the treatment advances in two sites of FL (nodal and Gastrointestinal FL), however, their difference is not involved in. Please cleared this issue.
   
   **#Response:** Thank you for your precise suggestion. I added new description of the difference in treatment strategies between nodal FL and GI-FL at the last paragraph. Further, I added the new two references of [106] and [107] along with that change.

3. **Reviewer’s comment:** “Please clearly check the incite information of Ref, ex. “Most GI-FL cases are …. have been reported” was incited by Ref#11 (P4) and the similar content was incited by Ref#10 (P22). In fact, the corresponding information is not found in Ref#11 (P266-279).
   
   **#Response:** Thank you for your precise and proper comment. The reference of [11] was wrong and I deleted it, and I added new reference of [6] Yoshino T, et al. along with that change. I checked all the references in the entire manuscript for mistakes. No other mistakes were not shown. The references of the entire manuscript were also rearranged in the same order according to the reviewer-2’s comment.

Reviewer #2:

1. **Reviewer’s comment:** “This review gives an extensive overview of the current state of nodal and gastrointestinal follicular lymphoma treatment, and could be of use to oncologists of any variety.”
   
   **#Response:** Thank you so much for your overall positive estimation for the submitted manuscript.
2. Reviewer’s comment: “My comments and suggestions. 1. The review appears to have been written in a chaotic and disorganized manner. The sections are not clearly marked and demarcated. Each section needs a brief conclusion.”

#Response: Thank you for your useful and valuable comment. I revised the manuscript in proper manner. Further, I newly added the brief conclusions at the last of each paragraph, and I added the new section of “Future prospects for nodal FL treatment”.

Reviewer’s comment: “2. It would be better to place the incidence statistics at the beginning rather than the end of the introduction section.”

#Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. I think you are right and I placed the incidence statistics at the beginning of the introduction section.

3. Reviewer’s comment: “3. The MS should include specific data regarding the utilization of PD1 blockade, as well as any treatments that use the immune system, in its own individual paragraph.”

#Response: Thank you so much for your precise and valuable comment. I reorganized the section of "1. antibody-based therapy" into three sections, "1-1. monoclonal antibody-based therapy", "1-2. bispecific T cell binding antibody (BTE)" and "1-3. anti-PD-L1 antibody" respectively. I newly added the clinical trials in Table 2. in which descriptions are in the text, and additional descriptions are now in red. Further, I listed each section of "PD-L1 antibody", "Bruton’s Tyrosine Kinase inhibitor (BTKi)", "pro-apoptotic pathway inhibitors (BCL2 inhibitor)", and "PI3K/mTOR inhibitor" in their own independent sections. The references were also rearranged in the same order accordingly.

I tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. And here we did not list the changes but marked in red in revised paper. We appreciate for Editor’s and Reviewers’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Thank you again, and I look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

Takuya Watanabe, MD, PhD.
Watanabe Internal Medicine Aoyama Clinic
Niigata, Japan