

Peer Review File

Article information: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/gs-22-410>

First round of peer review

Reviewer A

minor point;

Comment: The periods, in which the patients were enrolled, were different between "abstract" and "Patients and methods" in the main text.

Reply: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. We changed the periods of enrolled patients in the main text, "Patents and methods". So, the periods, in which the patients were enrolled, were same between "Abstract" and "Patients and methods" in the main text.

Changes in the text: We modified our text as advised (see Page 5, line 86).

Reviewer B

Major points:

Comment 1: I suggest to divide study group according to median age it means 48.5 years than 50 (Table 1).

Reply 1: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. We changed to divide study group according to median age it means 48.5 years.

Changes in the text: We modified our text as advised (see Page 8, line 158, Table 1).

Comment 2: In paragraph related to Statistical analysis you did not describe all statistical test. You should add information related to ROC analysis.

Reply 2: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. We add information related to ROC analysis in paragraph related to Statistical analysis.

Changes in the text: We modified our text as advised (see Page 6/7, line 123 ~ 131).

Comment 3: Authors should provide detailed description related to treatment patterns.

Reply 3: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. We provide detailed description related to treatment patterns in Clinical assessment paragraph.

Changes in the text: We modified our text as advised (see Page 5, line 100 ~ 106).

Comment 4: Authors should replace term Lumpectomy by Breast-conserving surgery (Table 1).

Reply 4: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. We replace term Lumpectomy by Breast-conserving surgery in Table 1.

Changes in the text: We modified our text as advised (see Page 8, line 158, Table 1).

Comment 5: Authors should provide p-value for parameters included to ROC analysis (Table 2). In my

opinion parameters RDW before-treatment and RPR before-treatment and post-treatment are insignificant.

Reply 5: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. We provide p-value for ROC analysis in Statistical analysis paragraph. As reviewer opinion, parameters RDW before-treatment ($p = 0.872$) and RPR before-treatment ($p = 0.718$) and post-treatment ($p = 0.081$) are insignificant.

Changes in the text: We modified our text as advised (see Page 6/7, line 123 ~ 131).

Comment 6: In my opinion sensitivity and specificity for those parameters are quite low. Maybe is better to use median as a cut-off point?

Reply 6: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. However, when use median value as a cut-off point, there were hardly any significant values.

Comment 7: Authors should use one term in respect to post-treatment values. Since in Table 2 you used after treatment.

Reply 7: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. We replaced the term “post-treatment” with the “after-treatment”.

Changes in the text: We modified our text as advised (see Page 2, line37/Page 3, line 42/45/47/52, Page 21, line 249).

Comment 8: All tables and figures should have separate description directly above or under table or figure, respectively.

Reply 8: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. We replaced all tables and figures should have separate description directly above or under table or figure, respectively.

Changes in the text: We modified our text as advised (see Page 7, line 141/Page 7, line 144/Page11, line 162/Page 17, line 210/Page 18, line 214).

Comment 9: Please provide interquartile range in respect to follow-up.

Reply 9: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. We replaced provide interquartile range in respect to follow-up.

Changes in the text: We modified our text as advised (see Page 7, line 141).

Minor points:

Please improve the quality of all figures. Also, the symbols could be little bit bigger in all figures.

Reply: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. We improve the quality of all figures and the symbols could be little bit bigger in all figures.

Changes in the text: We modified our text as advised (see Page 7, line 141/Page 7, line 144/Page11, line 162/Page 17, line 210/Page 18, line 214).

Reviewer C

Comment 1: The paper is too complicated and too hard to follow should remove all abbreviations.

Reply 1: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. We tried to remove the abbreviations as much as possible, but removing the RDW and RPR abbreviations made the paper more complicated, so we had to remove the abbreviations except for RDW and RPR.

Changes in the text: We modified our text as advised (see Page 2, line 43/ Page 6, line 128,129/Page 8, line 156/ Page 12, line 176,177).

Comment 2: should use rdw and platelet count as the two independent variables can bring in rpr later or after main analysis

Reply 2: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. As your advice, we tried to get the result using platelet as an independent variable, but it was insignificant, so we tried it with RPR variable.

Comment 3: adjust for size, nodes, grade. simplify

Reply 3: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. We adjust that the tumor size, nodes and grade for simplify.

Changes in the text: We modified our text as advised (see Page 8, line 158, Table 1).

Comment 4: platelet count should be a variable on its own

Reply 4: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. As your advice, we tried to get the result using platelet as an independent variable, but it was insignificant, so we tried it with RPR variable.

Comment 5: suffice to say measurement before treatment were not predictive don't need to show the data in detail

Reply 5: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. We removed the measurement before treatment data.

Changes in the text: We removed our text as advised (see previous Figure 2(a)/(c), Figure 3(a)/(c)).

Comment 6: very difficult to conclude much with only 14 deaths

Reply 6: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. In particular, in overall survival, it can be very difficult to conclude as the final death is only 14. These contents were mentioned in Discussion paragraph.

Changes in the text: We added our text as advised (see Page 21, line 257,258).

Second round of peer review

Reviewer A

The authors described the relationship between RDW, RPR and prognosis in the breast cancer patients.

Recently, various blood cell markers have been reported to be prognostic factors. Further sturdy on details including mechanism or intervention should be carried out.

Reply: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. We added your comments in the main text, “Discussion”.

Changes in the text: We modified our text as advised (see Page 21, line 262-263).

Reviewer C

1. need to rewrite paper

Reply: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. We rewrite paper as comments from reviewer’s opinions.

Changes in the text: We modified our text as advised (see Page 5, line 86), (see Page 8, line 158, Table 1), (see Page 6/7, line 123 ~ 131), (see Page 5, line 100 ~ 106), (see Page 8, line 158, Table 1), (see Page 6/7, line 123 ~ 131), (see Page 2, line 37/Page 3, line 42/45/47/52, Page 21, line 249), (see Page 7, line 141/Page 7, line 144/Page 11, line 162/Page 17, line 210/Page 18, line 214), (see Page 7, line 141), (see Page 7, line 141/Page 7, line 144/Page 11, line 162/Page 17, line 210/Page 18, line 214), (see Page 2, line 43/ Page 6, line 128,129/Page 8, line 156/ Page 12, line 176,177), (see Page 8, line 158, Table 1), (see previous Figure 2(a)/(c), Figure 3(a)/(c)), (see Page 21, line 257,258), (see Page 21, line 262-263).

2. review statistics

Reply: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. We review statistics with the statistical support team in our hospital, and the same result was obtained. Nevertheless, we think the reviewer’s comment is justified, because of the low number of deaths and recurrence in breast cancer patients.

3. hazard ratios are not valid

Reply: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your kind comments. In Cox analysis, hazard ratios are not valid in some cases, but in others, it was meaningfully found that p value < 0.05 . Nevertheless, we think the reviewer’s comment is justified, because of the low number of deaths and recurrence in breast cancer patients.