

Peer Review File

Article information: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tcr-20-1825>

Reviewer A:

Comment 1: The manuscript should be revised for better use of English grammar

Reply 1: Thanks for your kind comments. The manuscript has been revised by a native English-speaking expert who is majoring in my field.

Changes in the text: see page 2, line 3-5, 7-8, 11-12, 19-20, page 3, line 6-8, page 12, line 14, 19, page 13, line 2, 9 and so on (see many details in the "Track Changes").

Comment 2: The statement that married individual has longer survival is limited by confounders. Married could be younger than widows, also have a more structured health environment with less health neglect than widows, and as stated in the manuscript, most likely to be sexually active which also will favor early diagnosis.

Reply 2: Thanks for your valuable comments. We agree with the opinion of the reviewer and have modified our text as advised.

Changes in the text: see page 2, line 16-17 and page 3, line 6-8.

Comment 3: Older individuals have worse 5 years survival in any condition, not only vaginal cancer.

Reply 3: Thanks for your valuable comments. As the reviewer said, the 5-year survival rate of elderly cancer patients is generally lower than younger ones. However, it has been reported that there is no difference in survival rate between younger and older patients with vaginal cancer (see references 12 and 36 for details). Therefore, we analyzed the influence of age on the survival rate of vaginal cancer again, and finally verified that the 5-year survival rate of elderly patients with vaginal cancer was lower than younger ones.

Changes in the text: No changes.

Comment 4: The discussion and the lit search are good.

Reply 4: Thank you for your kind comments.

Changes in the text: No changes.

Reviewer B:

Major points;

Comment 1: In Results of Abstract, authors mentioned that marital status was important prognostic factor for survival. However, in multivariate analysis, this was not independent risk factor. So, authors should describe in a different way.

Reply 1: Thanks for your valuable comments. We have modified our text as advised.

Changes in the text: see page 2, line 16-17 and page 3, line 6-8.

Comment 2: Figure 1 is the survival curve of total patients. Why do you use the chi square test and p value in figure 1 legend?

Reply 2: Thanks for your valuable comments. We have modified our text as advised.

Changes in the text: see page 24, Figure 1 legend.

Comment 3: Authors should describe legend of a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h and change the graph to a paper format, not a simple original format in Figure 2.

Reply 3: Thanks for your valuable comments. We have modified our text as advised.

Changes in the text: see page 24 and Figure 2.

Comment 4: It's better to use HR for univariate analysis in Table 2 and 3.

Reply 4: Thanks for your valuable comments. We have modified our text as advised.

Changes in the text: see page 26-28, Table 2 and 3.

Minor points

Comment 1: Percentage statistics should be expressed as a single decimal place in this manuscript.

Reply 1: Thanks for your kind comments. We have modified our text as advised.

Changes in the text: see page 2, line 10-14, 16-17, page 7, line 4-11, 14-20 and so on (see many details in the "Track Changes").

Comment 2: Abstracts results line 11; aged ≥ 80 -> aged ≥ 80 years

Reply 2: Thanks for your kind comments. We have modified our text as advised.

Changes in the text: see page 2, line 10.

Comment 3: Abstracts conclusion line 8; aged ≥ 80 seems -> aged ≥ 80 years seems

Reply 3: Thanks for your valuable comments. We have modified our text as advised.

Changes in the text: see page 3, line 8.

Comment 4: "Analysis" would be deleted in Key Words

Reply 4: Thanks for your valuable comments. We have deleted "Analysis" in Key Words.

Changes in the text: see page 3, line 11.

Comment 5: Introduction, Page 6, Line 10; Widowed -> widowed

Reply 5: Thanks for your valuable comments. We have modified our text as advised.

Changes in the text: see page 6, line 10.

Comment 6: Adjust spacing between columns in Table 1.

Reply 6: Thanks for your kind comments. We have modified our text as advised.

Changes in the text: see page 25, Table 1.

Comment 7: use footnote for 'css' in Table 3.

Reply 7: Thanks for your kind comments. We have modified our text as advised.

Changes in the text: see page 27, Table 2.