

We request that you submit your revision in no more than **14 days**.

Comments from the Editors and Reviewers:

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade A (Priority publishing)

**Conclusion:** Minor revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** Overall an excellently written report of a well-designed study with a lot of clinical applicability.

I would suggest a few small changes prior to publication:

1) where the term "prognosis" is used in the manuscript, replace with "long-term prognosis" to differentiate these from short-term outcomes.

Response: Thanks for your suggestion, we have replaced "prognosis" with "long-term prognosis" in the manuscript.

2) The abstract should more explicitly state if this was a retrospective or prospective study.

Response: We have made corrections in the abstract-methods section, thanks for your suggestions.

3) The abstract uses the term "POD" without clarification.

Response: We have made corrections in the summary-results section. Replace "POD" with "postoperative day".

4) "780 thousand" should be "780,000" (it is not usual English language convention to write the word thousand in these scenarios).

Response: We have modified in the introduction section and changed "780 thousand" to "780,000".

5) There should be a citation after "Pathologic stage according to the American Joint Committee on Cancer, 7th Edition".

Response: We have cited related article in the corresponding locations. Edge SB, Byrd DR, Compton CC, et al. American Joint Committee on Cancer AJCC Cancer Staging Manual. 7th ed[M]. New York, NY: Springer, 2010.

6) in Statistical analysis, "qualitative variables were described as numbers (%)" should be "categorical variables were described as numbers and percentages"

Response: Thank you for your correction, we have revised the manuscript.

7) "quantitative variables" should be "continuous variables"

Response: We have revised the manuscript. We made some mistakes because of cultural differences and expression problems, thank you very much for modifying our statistical method.

8) It should be stated that non-normally distributed continuous data should be compared with median and interquartile range, as is scientific convention (not mean +/- standard deviation which only applies to normally distributed data).

Response: We are very sorry that we have made some low-level errors in statistics. Thank you for your correction. We have revised the manuscript.

9) Fig 3 legend: "stage II" is misspelled as "stgsge II"

Response: Sorry, this is a spelling error that shouldn't have appeared, we have corrected it.

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript in a serious and responsible manner, which will help to further improve the quality of our research. We revised all the questions you raised in the article after discussion. Thank you for reviewing our manuscript again.