

Response to Editor and Reviewers Comments

Manuscript NO.: 63907, Retrospective Study

Development and Validation of a Prognostic Nomogram for Colorectal Cancer after Surgery

Bo-Wen Li, Xiao-Yu Ma, Shuang Lai, Xin Sun, Ming-Jun Sun, Bing Chang

We gratefully appreciate for your reply and valuable suggestions for the manuscript. According to the suggestions, we have revised our manuscript, polished the language of our manuscript in <https://www.aje.com/> and added the 'Article Highlights' section. We also have submitted the original figure documents to the F6Publishing system at <https://www.f6publishing.com>. Here, we made a point-by-point response, we hope to be able to meet the requirements for publication, if you are not satisfied with the revised manuscript, we will make a second revision.

Bing Chang, Corresponding
author

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This is an interesting paper. There are some statements which were mentioned in introduction but also repeated in discussion (eg- LODDS is defined as the logarithm of the ratio between the number of PLNs and negative LNs when the LNs are examined. The formula to calculate LODDS is $\log [(PLN + 0.05)/(RLN - PLN + 0.05)]$).

Response: Yes, we are grateful for your valuable comments, your suggestion makes our introduction and discussion succincter and clearer. We have deleted the repetitive parts in both introduction and discussion.

We have deleted 'It is another novel system to evaluate LN metastasis. The formula is $\log [(the\ number\ of\ PLNs+0.05)/(the\ number\ of\ negative\ nodes\ +0.05)]$.' in paragraph 5, 'Its excellent predictive ability was also shown in cervical cancer and gallbladder cancer.' in paragraph 5, 'Although the LNR system and LODDS system can reduce staging migration to some extent, the two systems ignore the TD condition of CRC.' in paragraph 6, 'A recent study showed that TD was an independent adverse prognostic factor for the overall survival (OS) of patients with CRC.' In paragraph 6 in introduction.

We have deleted 'The LNR is defined as the ratio of the number of PLNs to the number of RLNs.' in paragraph 5 and 'LODDS is defined as the logarithm of the ratio between the number of PLNs and negative LNs when the LNs are examined.' in paragraph 6 in discussion.

We have added 'Another adverse prognostic factor about LN condition for the overall survival (OS) of patients with CRC is TD.' and 'So, TD is necessary to act as another factor to evaluate the LN condition of patients with CRC.' in paragraph 6 in introduction.

We have added 'The formula to calculate LNR is PLN/RLN .' in paragraph 5 and 'LODDS is another novel system to evaluate LN metastasis.' in paragraph 6 in discussion.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: This is a well written manuscript with robust methodology and can have good clinical importance for the management of CRC.

Response: We are amazed to get your affirmation to our manuscript. Thank you for your careful review of our manuscript.