

## Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/gpm-23-35>

Comment 1: Page 1, Line 35: Would provide the PD-L1 positive data as comparison.

Reply 1: PD-L1 data was added to the text.

Changes in the text: “In comparison, in the PD-L1- positive population, that comprised 38% of the entire cohort, the addition of atezolizumab was comparable to placebo (HR, 0.86; 95% CI, 0.63 to 1.16; P = .30; median 15.2 v 13.1 months, respectively)”

Comment 2: Page 1, Lines 37-38: Since OS data was immature, it doesn't appear appropriate to mention it in this context and in the focus of interpreting evaluable data with PFS. Would delete OS time points and HR.

Reply 2: OS data and discussion was deleted throughout the review

Changes in the text: Lines 37-38 were deleted.

Comment 3: Page 2, Lines 49-57: Discussion of OS is confusing given the OS results are not mature for statistical analysis until late 2024. Why discuss now? Focus on Lines 46 to 57 are unwarranted and should be deleted. Would consider maintaining focus on interpretable data related to PFS and expand discussion on PD-L1 relationship to PFS and why PD-L1 status has been an inconsistent biomarker of immune activity with CPIs. Would also delete concluding value of OS from ATALANTE/ENGOT-0v29 study until data are interpretable (late 2024).

Reply 3: Thank you. OS discussion was omitted from the text. PD-L1 status and its correlation with PFS was expanded upon.

Changes in the text: “Additional subgroup PFS analyses, including subgroups of patients with both PD-L1-positive and CD8-positive tumors or those with BRCA mutation failed to show significant interaction with atezolizumab treatment”.

Comment 4: Page 2, Line 52: “ant” – typo.

Reply 4: This typo was corrected.