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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The authors reported a case with mCRPC and revealed a novel genetic mechanism of Olaparib resistance. 1. About the effective olaparib-abiraterone tx for a patient without damage repair gene alterations, the authors should provide more minute explanation of its mechanism. 2. Description concerning genetic counseling is totally lacking. The authors should explain this aspect of issue within genetic examination.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Manuscript No.: 60981  Title: Circulating tumor DNA genomic profiling reveals the complicated olaparib-resistance mechanism in prostate cancer salvage therapy: Case report  In this study, the author has studied “Circulating tumor DNA genomic profiling reveals the complicated olaparib-resistance mechanism in prostate cancer salvage therapy: Case report.” The topic is interesting, but the English language used in the manuscript needs major improvements as there are some punctuation and grammatical mistakes present throughout the manuscript. The figures required the proper explanation and caption. The study principle and objective are not clear. Moreover, research models are not discussed in an understandable manner; the introduction section is poor followed by literature, which reflects that the author needs a more comprehensive way of thinking. The discussion part is not up to the mark, and no significant comparison is made. Most of the references are from low impact journals. It is obvious that the quality of the manuscript does not fulfil the standards of the journal; therefore, it should be reconsidered after major revision.  Specific comments: 1. Page 3, line 18-19: “Serum total prostate-specific antigen (TPSA) level reduced and symptoms remitted for 4 mo.” What is ‘mo’? 2. The authors are advised to revise the ‘Core tip’. 3. Please add more strong keywords. 4. Page 5, line 2-3: “Prostate cancer is the sixth most commonly occurring malignant tumor in mainland China.” Please add more epidemiology of prostate cancer. 5. Page 5, line 9-10: “Poly (ADP-ribose) polymerase (PARP) inhibitors have displayed promising clinical results…” Would you please enlist the names of PARP inhibitors? 6. Page 5, The whole introduction section is general. Authors are advised to revise the introduction section carefully and add more data to
make an association between each paragraph to support the problem statement. It is recommended to add literature in the introduction section to create a research gap. 7. Page 5: What is the novelty of the present study? 8. Page 5, line 30-31: “A 61-year-old man presented to our hospital with complaint of continuous lumbosacral pain that had lasted for 3 mo” Please indicate the name of the hospital. 9. Page 6, line 27: “ADT in combination with docetaxel was applied as the initial treatment.” How much drug was used? And for how many days? 10. The discussion section is not up to the mark; authors only discussed general literature without any comparison of results. No limitations are enlisted, and no overall conclusion is added. Overall, the discussion section needs extensive revision. 11. Authors are advised to proofread the whole manuscript to overcome grammatical mistakes. 12. The figures need proper interpretation and appropriate captions, and proper labelling. 13. Please revise the references according to the journal instructions.
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The authors made point by point response to the reviewer comments. So, it should be accepted in the present form.