

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' earnest comments on our manuscript entitled "Develop a nomogram to predict overall survival of patients with borderline ovarian tumors" (Manuscript ID: 73612). We found the comments valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper. We have read the comments carefully and have made corrections accordingly, which we hope will meet your approval. The main corrections in the paper and the responses to the reviewers' comments are as follows:

Reviewer #1: The article is within the scope of the journal, and the subject is interesting. It is well written and easy to read. Likewise, the content has been properly organized. The experiment described is well developed and the results obtained are valuable for the area of knowledge. A discussion is held about the research carried out. The article could be improved if the conclusions are extended to synthesize the scientific contribution of the article, and to describe in more detail the lines of future work.

Response: Thank you for your great advice. We have added more detailed information which is marked in red below to the conclusions. "Considering its accuracy and clinical value, the current nomogram in the present study could provide an individualized evaluation of the prognosis of patients with BOTs. **Our research will be beneficial for clinicians to make clinical treatment recommendations and patients to better know their therapeutic options, thus improving patients' compliance and prognosis. Besides, we will collect more BOTs patients from different cohorts to validate the model from the external aspect in the future.** Additional data and studies are needed to determine whether it can be applied to the total BOT cohort." Thank you again.

Reviewer #2: In this research, above all, the authors conducted the construction of a proposed nomogram which could accurately predict 1, 3, 5-year overall survival in patients with borderline ovarian cancer. The methodology is adequate and detailed, the tables and figures are illustrative and well displayed, and the authors interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. Excellent manuscript. No english polishing is required.

Response: Thank you very much for your affirmation and approval to our research. We wish our study will help more patients and clinicians.

Science editor: This manuscript retrospectively analyzed the clinical characteristics and survival outcomes of 192 histologically verified BOT patients and 374 EOC patients, and discussed the possibility of constructing nomogram to predict the overall survival (OS) of BOT patients. It is suggested to further enrich the conclusion and explain the future research direction.

Response: Thank you for your valuable suggestion. According to your advice, we have made some improvement which is marked in red below to the conclusion. "Considering its accuracy and clinical value, the current nomogram in the present study could provide an individualized evaluation of the prognosis of patients with BOTs. **Our research will be beneficial for clinicians to make clinical treatment recommendations and patients to better know their therapeutic options, thus improving patients' compliance and prognosis. Besides, we will collect more BOTs patients from different cohorts to validate the model from the external aspect in the future.** Additional data and studies are needed to determine whether it can be applied to the total BOT cohort." Besides, we have added some detailed explanation which is marked in red below to our future research. "**Besides, we will**

collect more BOTs patients from different cohorts to validate the model from the external aspect in the future. Additional data and studies are needed to determine whether it can be applied to the total BOT cohort.”

Company editor-in-chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, 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. 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: Thank you for your kindness and help. We have revised the manuscript according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office’s comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision. Besides, we have uploaded the the original figure documents.

Thank you again for your advice. We have revised all the inappropriate part that you pointed out. Then our revised manuscript has been polished by the professional English language editing company over again. We appreciated your patience. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for all you have done for us. We are looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,

Yan Zhang