

Dear Editor,

please find below our responses to the reviewers' point-by-point.

We accurately checked the steps indicated in your e-mail, as follows:

1. We revised our manuscript according to the reviewers' comments and to the Editor's indications. Please find below the responses point-by-point.
2. We updated the manuscript according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision-Review. The only exception is in the Title, with more than 12 words (and also running title, more than 6 words), because of our previous agreements with the Editorial Office.
3. We provided the audio core tip.
4. We subjected the manuscript to *CrossCheck* analysis.
5. We provided the files related to academic rules and norms, please find the attached conflict-of-interest statement as signed pdf file.
6. The copy of the full approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s)/letter(s) were not necessary because we had no fundings to declare, as we stated in the signed form.
7. We revised the language of our manuscript. We attached the language certificate for the first author, which is non-native English speaker but she has a Cambridge English language certification of the British Council. Moreover, the English native reviewers (2 from U.S.A.) gave a very positive language evaluation, as well as all the other reviewers.
8. We signed the Copyright Assignment form.
9. We submitted the revised manuscript and all related documents.

Response to the Editor's comments:

- We provided the conflict-of-interest statement as signed pdf file.
- We provided the audio core tip.
- We provided PubMed citation numbers and DOI citation to the reference list and I listed all authors.

Response to reviewer 00068723:

We are grateful for the almost all positive comments.

We agree that our results cover a wide range of cancers, but to make them less confusing we divided the results by cancer types in different paragraphs. Each paragraph summarizes the current status for each cancer type.

As suggested, we added a paragraph with our opinion about future directions of PD-1/PD-L1.

Response to reviewer 01560464

We are grateful for the positive comments.

No revisions were suggested by this reviewer.

Response to reviewer 00729478

We are grateful for the positive comments.

No revisions were suggested by this reviewer.

Response to reviewer 02664527

We are grateful for the almost all positive comments.

We avoided to exceed with details about management of adverse events and about imaging and irRC because the paper covers a wide range of issues and a wider explanation about these aspects would be too heavy for a quick and complete comprehension of the topic.

Some typographical/grammatical mistakes have been corrected, as suggested (the corrections are highlighted in the text).

Response to reviewer 00071368

We are grateful for the positive comments.

We provided a separate new Table listing all of the CKI discussed and their targets, as suggested, replacing the numeration for the previous Tables.

We corrected the highlighted points.

In addition, we provided some updated data according to very recent publications, properly adding or replacing the respective references and shifting the previous references' numbers (please pay attention to all references numbers, that have been changed both in text and tables).

Best regards

Dr. Melissa Bersanelli & Dr. Sebastiano Buti