
Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/gs-23-275>

Reviewer A

I read with great interest the Manuscript titled " Preliminary study on the efficacy of a PD-1 inhibitor combined with antiangiogenic agents in the treatment of recurrent MSI-H endometrial cancer", topic interesting enough to attract readers' attention.

Although the manuscript can be considered already of good quality, I would suggest following recommendations:

- I suggest a round of language revision, in order to correct few typos and improve readability.

Reply 1: Thank you for your comment. This is a very important suggestion, and the language improvement will greatly help the readability of our article. We attach great importance to this problem, and the article has been refined. Thank you again.

Changes in the text: Because the changes are too much and too messy please allow us not to show one by one here. Some of the changes in the article are still visible in word's revision mode. Thank you again.

- It would be interesting to discuss results of this study in the scenario of the current molecular classification and novel insights into molecular mechanisms of endometrial cancer and how could help to determine more accurately prognosis, choose a tailored management and future directions. I would be glad if the authors discuss this important point, referring to PMID: 36833105 and 36979434.

Reply 2: Thank you for your comment. Thank you very much for your valuable suggestions. Your suggestions have greatly improved the discussion of molecular typing of endometrial cancer in our article, which has further improved the value of this article. We attach great importance to this, and make serious modifications, hoping to get your approval. Thank you again.

Changes in the text: We added some discussion (see Page 8, Line 227-234). Thank you again.

Because of these reasons, the article should be revised and completed. Considering all these points, I think it could be of interest to the readers and, in my opinion, it deserves the priority to be published after minor revisions.

Reviewer B

1) First of all, my major concern regarding this study is the very small sample size and the over-stated conclusion of “have good therapeutic effects”, because of no a control group receiving standard treatment. The authors need to reconsider the clinical research design, I think a case series seems to be more appropriate than a prospective cohort study, eight cases cannot be a cohort study!!.

Reply 1: Thank you for your comment. This is very professional and valuable advice. Many thanks to this reviewer for such excellent suggestions, and we feel very honored to have met such an excellent reviewer. We attach great importance to your suggestions and have made corresponding changes. In the text we add “case series” expression and in the section of conclusions we changed the “have good therapeutic effects” into “may have good therapeutic effects”. Thank you again.

Changes in the text: We have modified our text as advised (see Page 2, Line 40; Page 2, Line 43; Page 4, Line 90; Page 8, Line 237; Page 8, Line 247). Thank you again.

2) Second, the title needs to indicate efficacy and safety and the clinical research design of this study.

Reply 2: Thank you for your comment. Thank you very much for giving such constructive comments. We quite agree with your opinion. So we change the title to “A case series on the efficacy and safety of a PD-1 inhibitor combined with antiangiogenic agents in the treatment of recurrent MSI-H endometrial cancer”. Thank you again.

Changes in the text: We have modified our title as advised (see Page 1, line 3-4). Thank you again.

3) Third, the abstract needs some revisions. The background did not describe why PD-1 inhibitor combined with antiangiogenic agents is potentially effective and what the unique clinical contribution of this research is. The methods need to describe details of the intervention and measurements of efficacy and safety outcomes. The current conclusion needs to be tone down due to the small sample size.

Reply 3: Thank you for your comment. Thank you very much for your important advice. We apologize for the insufficient content of the abstract. Unfortunately, due to the word count of the abstract, it is difficult for us to fully describe the background and method. However, in response to the modification of your proposed conclusions, we have made corresponding modifications. In the section of conclusions we changed the “have good therapeutic effects” into “may have good therapeutic effects. Hope to get your approval. Thank you again.

Changes in the text: We have modified our title as advised (see Page 2, line 43; Page 8, line 247). Thank you again.

4) Fourth, in the introduction of the main text, the authors need to review what has been known on the treatment strategies for patients with MSI-H/dMMR relapsed EC, why PD-1 inhibitor combined with antiangiogenic agents is potentially effective, and what the knowledge gap is on the efficacy data of PD-1 inhibitor combined with antiangiogenic agents for MSI-H/dMMR relapsed EC.

Reply 4: Thank you for your comment. Thank you very much for your important advice. We attach great importance to your suggestion and take it seriously. We have added relevant content in the Introduction section, hoping to get your approval. Thank you again.

Changes in the text: We have modified our title as advised (see Page 3, line 66-70; Page 3, line 77-83). Thank you again.

5) Fifth, in the methodology of the main text, the author's need to reconsider the clinical research design of this study, their considerations for the current sample size, and a space part for the statistical methods of this study.

Reply 5: Thank you for your comment. Thank you for such a pertinent suggestion. We attach great importance to your suggestion. In the methodology section, "a prospective observational study" was changed into "a case series study". Hope to get your approval. Thank you again.

Changes in the text: We have modified our title as advised (see Page 4, line 90:). Thank you again.

6) Finally, please consider to cite the two related studies in this manuscript: 1. Zhang J, An L, Zhou X, Shi R, Wang H. Analysis of tumor mutation burden combined with immune infiltrates in endometrial cancer. *Ann Transl Med* 2021;9(7):551. doi: 10.21037/atm-20-6049. 2. Yang Y, Sang ZY, Ma J, Zhu YP, Wu SF. KRAS, YWHAE, SP1 and MSRA as biomarkers in endometrial cancer. *Transl Cancer Res* 2021;10(3):1295-1312. doi: 10.21037/tcr-20-2969.

Reply 6: Thank you for your comment. We have cited the above two articles. Thank you again.

Changes in the text: We have modified our title as advised (see Page 8, line 232). Thank you again.