

Dear Audrius Dulskas and Anonymous professor,

Thank you very much for your professional suggestions for my manuscript, which make it better. I reviewed the manuscript according to your suggestions, and here is the detail.

For Reviewer #1

1. Thanks for your suggestions for the title. I make it as your suggestion: The predictive value of a novel serum tumor biomarkers scoring system for clinical Stage II/III rectal cancer having neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy.
2. I mean the predictive value, which related to the outcomes.

For Audrius Dulskas,

1. INTRODUCTION

--I remove the TNT from introduction part and add paper, Smolskas E, Mikulskytė G, Sileika E, Suziedelis K, Dulskas A. Tissue-Based Markers as a Tool to Assess Response to Neoadjuvant Radiotherapy in Rectal Cancer-Systematic Review. Int J Mol Sci. 2022 May 27;23(11):6040., here.

2. MATERIALS and METHODS

- It is a retrospective study
- I defined all the abbreviation and add the information of SPSS.
- I make it clear about score 1 "other situations"?

3. RESULTS

- I defined all the abbreviation and avoided the shortenings.

4. DISCUSSION

- I corrected some mistype errors.
- if the predictive value was weaker than pTNM, which is always known, what is the purpose of performing additional tests?
- The pTNM is the most used predictive value but the pTNM value need the histopathological examinations. I performing additional test to show than our scoring system has a good predictive ability, which is close to pTNM, but only use biomarkers in blood.
- I tried to add some nomogram for the precise prognosis.

Thank you for all the suggestions!
Xiaoyu Wang