

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Reviewer 00040631

Despite it is a retrospective study, I think it merits publication in your journal, provided that:

1. the authors add the full name of the prognostic factors in brackets after the abbreviations PLR, NLR, LMR, PNI etc, not only in the text, but in the abstract as well.
2. the authors add that a limitation of the study is the fact that almost one third of the initial number of pts have been excluded due to several reasons, i.e. death within 30 days etc
3. the authors delete their statement that the fact that this study is from one single center is a limitation, as it is not, because it ensures a more homogeneous evaluation and less loss of data compared with a multicentric study
4. the authors spend a few words saying that a partial subgroup analysis of the evaluated prognostic factors in the different staging groups would have been an interesting finding. Maybe they will be able to do that, if not in this study, in further evaluation on larger series involving other centers

1. The full name of the prognostic factors in brackets after the abbreviations PLR, NLR, LMR, PNI etc, added also in the abstract.

2. According to the second advice: "The major limitations of the present paper are; its retrospective nature and exclusion of approximately one third of the initial number of patients for various reasons. Furthermore, CRP is not routinely measured prior to CRC resection at our centre, and, therefore, comparison of CRP with the other inflammatory predictors was not possible." Added to discussion.

3. According to third advice: "On the other hand being in a single center ensures a more homogeneous evaluation and less loss of data compared with a multicentric study.. Besides this, the evaluation of these prognostic factors separately in different disease stages may be a different study subject." Added to discussion.

4. According to fourth advice: "The evaluation of these prognostic factors separately

in different disease stages may also be a valuable different study subject.” Added to discussion.