

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The study is a RETROSPECTIVE STUDY and the authors have mentioned that data period of study is "Between January 1, 2013 and December,1, 2021" December 1, 2021 has not arrived yet.

Response: Thanks for your advice, we have submitted to our paper, the Charlesworth Author Services (CAS) team (<https://www.cwauthors.com.cn/>) had helped us improve our language and correct grammatical errors existed in our manuscript. The CAS team confirmed that their proofreader had done a very good job of improving language and correcting grammatical errors. We also checked the manuscript again and again, and we couldn't find grammatical errors.

In this study, we intend to collect data between January 1, 2013 and December,1, 2021. However, as the case system enters the change plan, we have corrected the specific time for the cases that are not included in the time range, as follows:

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

Specific Comments to Authors:

1. First, the authors did a huge amount of work on this topic and they are to be congratulated. In this study, ML-based integrated analysis is a new computer-based method, which has not been used in predicting response of NACT in breast cancer. I appreciate this is a practical way to solve clinical problem.

Response: Thanks for your advice, we agree with you that ML-based integrated analysis is a new computer-based method, which has not been used in predicting response of NACT in breast cancer. We believe that ML-based model is a practical way to solve clinical problem.

2. In this study, the authors draw a conclusion that ML performed better than models using conventional methods, and the SVM model performed best. I suggest that how to concretize the clinical application of SVM needs to be explained in detail by the author in the article. I firmly believe that it will be easier for readers to understand.

Response: Thanks for your advice. In this study, we have described the specific steps of machine learning algorithm in detail, which have been shown in the methodology section.

3. In this study, the authors have evaluated the performance of ML-based models, Some ML-based models performed better than models using conventional statistical methods in both ROC curves. If possible, more external data is used to verify the robustness of the model, which will make the results more convincing.

Response: Thanks for your advice. We agree with you very much. Although we have established a robust prediction model in this study, we still need to establish a large sample external cohort verification in future clinical application.

EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

(1) Science editor:

This manuscript is a retrospective analysis of 487 breast cancer patients, aiming at establishing a new prediction model based on machine learning (ML) to predict the probability of rNACT in breast cancer patients who plan to receive NACT. The case selection time is as of December 1, 2021, please verify; and it is suggested more external data be used to verify the robustness of the model.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Response: Thanks for your advice. We agree with you very much. Although we have established a robust prediction model in this study, we still need to establish a large sample external cohort verification in future clinical application. Hence, we decide to collect more external data be used to verify the robustness of the model.

(2) 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 Clinical Cases, 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. The title of the manuscript is too long and must be shortened to meet the requirement of the journal (Title: The title should be no more than 18 words). 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. 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. Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s).

Response: Thanks for your suggestion. The title of the manuscript is too long and must be shortened to meet the requirement of the journal (Title: The title should be no more than 18 words).

We have modified the title, as follows:

Added value of systemic inflammation markers for monitoring response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in breast cancer patients

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.

Reponse: Thanks for your suggestion. We have used PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.