

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/gs-24-40>

Reviewer A

I found the article of great interest and pertinence, well written and methodologically correct.

Only some minor observations.

On page 8, line 183, it lacks a space between “similar” and “to”.

Response: We have corrected this mistake.

See below

“cohort’s average FACT-B scores became similar to that at the baseline, which indicated that the”

On page 15, Table 1, it’s necessary to review the age interval - I assume the age intervals are less and equal to 45, and greater than 45.

Response: We have corrected this mistake.

See it as below:

Age, years			0.126
≤ 45	32	30	
> 45	30	33	

Is it relevant that the marital status “married” should be classified as “newly”?

Response: We have corrected this mistake.

See it as below:

Marital status			0.884
Married	19	16	
Never married/separated/divorced/widowed	43	47	

And lastly, on page 16, the table shows the number of patients who underwent Chemotherapy, followed by the number of patients with “Adjuvant”. I assume you refer to “Neo-adjuvant chemotherapy” and “Adjuvant Chemotherapy”, and if so, it should be clearer if identified.

Response: We have corrected this mistake.

See it as below:

Neo-adjuvant chemotherapy			0.814
Yes	23	20	
No	39	43	
Adjuvant Chemotherapy			0.709
Yes	32	30	
No	30	33	

Like I said, tiny issues.

I enjoyed reading the article very much.

Reviewer B

Should clarify certain aspects of the article, in particular:

- Has this clinical trial been registered? if so, where?

Response: This clinical trial has not been registered, but the study protocol (available online only) was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Xinhua Hospital affiliated with the Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine (XHEC-D-2023-203).

- If you identify the hospital, I suggest you don't, instead you could just put General Hospital in China, it would change the whole text;

Response: This has no impact on the paper.

- Throughout the article, you refer to participants, but your sample is only women, why don't you mention women? because at one point, we wondered if you also included men? (it only becomes clear in the table of characteristics);

Response: All the participants were women. I added in Line 145.

- How did you design the intervention program? I found one that was very similar, if not the same.... does your study intend to replicate this study? take a look:

- Zhou, Kaina; Wang, Wen; Zhao, Wenqian; Li, Lulu; Zhang, Mengyue; Guo, Pingli; Zhou, Can; Li, Minjie; An, Jinghua; Li, Jin; Li, Xiaomei (2020). Benefits of a WeChat-based multimodal nursing program on early rehabilitation in postoperative women with breast cancer: A clinical randomized controlled trial. International Journal of Nursing Studies, 106(), 103565-. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2020.103565

- Zhao N, Yin F, Wu X, Zhong Y. The effectiveness of a WeChat-based multimodal nursing

program for women with breast cancer: A randomized controlled trial protocol. Medicine (Baltimore). 2020 Dec 24;99(52):e23526. doi: 10.1097/MD.00000000000023526. PMID: 33350732; PMCID: PMC7769314.

Response: Our research referred to these two papers.

- *In the intervention cohort, you mention that the protocol was administered during hospitalization... did it start preoperatively? postoperatively? on what day?*

Response: In Figure 1, first row, we explained intervention start from hospital admission to 24 weeks after surgery (Stage I-II).

- *They only talk about 3 moments of evaluation throughout the work (2, 8 and 24 weeks) and they also carried it out before the program was implemented, right?*

Response: Yes, they made evaluation both preoperative and postoperative.

- *Is the CARS-J instrument validated for your country? Who validated it?*

Response: Yes, the doctor and nurse in charge of follow-up were assessed together

- *Were there any adverse effects during the program?*

Response: *There are no adverse effects during the program.*

- *They make no reference to the time period in which the study took place.*

Response: From June 2021 to August 2022, I added in Line 145.

- *who evaluated the program? which professionals?*

Response: The doctor and nurse in charge of follow-up were assessed together

- *how did you arrive at the size of the study?*

Response: From June 2021 to July 2022 in one year period, 210 patients were all we got, and all were assessed for eligibility and 125 patients met the inclusion criteria. With the follow-up and statistical analysis, we found intervention group had a significant better improvement.

- *How was follow-up carried out?*

Response: *We used We-CHAT app for contact and also patients come to the hospital for reexamination when we did follow-up as well.*

- *how did you randomize the participants? using a computer, for example?*

Response: *We used a computer randomize sheet to enroll the participants into two group. (Added in line 147)*

- *what measures were taken to avoid bias?*

- *how did you follow up the program when the women went home? with home visits? by telephone?*

Response: We follow up the program by the wechat.