

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jtd-23-1555>

Reviewer A

The article entitled “A novel neoadjuvant therapy for early-stage non-small cell lung cancer” presents an interesting study on a new therapy at the preclinical level for neoadjuvant therapy of NSCLC. Undoubtedly, the main value of the article is its originality, as it deals with a highly topical subject that is changing the natural history of lung cancer.

In an overall review of the article, I believe that it is correctly written with a correct structure and easy comprehension. The language needs to be edited due to the fact that there are errors, which, although not very big, do detract from the quality of the article. The rest of the article does not need major changes and the different parts of the article are generally correct. The references used are mostly current and allow a global revision of the manuscript. The figures used are those requested by the article and do not need to be edited. At the level of methodology and results, I believe that the authors use an adequate research, being the methodology used the correct one to be able to fulfill the objectives set by the authors. Therefore, in summary, I believe that except for some minor changes specified below, the article is acceptable for publication in the journal.

Comment 1: Title: I think it would be convenient to add that it is a preclinical therapy so as not to be misleading.

Reply 1: Thank you for your valuable advice. We agree with your suggestion and have changed the title to “A novel neoadjuvant therapy for early-stage non-small cell lung cancer in a mouse model.”

Changes in the text: Please see line 2.

Comment 2: Abstract and introduction: lung cancer is not the most frequently diagnosed neoplasm in the world. It is breast cancer including both sexes. Correction.

Reply 2: Thank you for your instructive suggestions. We have changed this sentence to “Lung cancer is the common malignancy with high mortality rate”.

Changes in the text: Please see lines 18 and 45.

Comment 3: Abstract: specify clearer data in the results of the abstract so that readers can get a better idea of the article if they can only read the abstract.

Reply 3: Thank you for your valuable advice. We have modified the results in abstract as advised (see lines 30-36).

Changes in the text: Please see lines 30-36.

Comment 4: Introduction, line 42: this data is not correct, correct.

Reply 4: Thank you for your reminding. We have revised the description (see line 47).

Changes in the text: Please see line 47.

Comment 5: Introduction, line 52: this data is not correct either. Neoadjuvant therapy is generally well tolerated, its major problem is efficacy especially in PD-L1 negative patients. Correction.

Reply 5: Thanks for your instructive suggestions. We have changed the relevant description (see lines 22-24, line 41 point 2, and lines 56-58).

Changes in the text: Please see lines 22-24, line 41 point 2, and lines 56-58.

Comment 6: Conclusions: the conclusions should be more modest than those indicated by the authors.

Reply 6: Thank you for your valuable advice. We have modified the conclusions in Abstract and Conclusions as advised (see lines 37-39 and lines 283-289).

Changes in the text: Please see lines 37-39 and lines 283-289.

Reviewer B

Comment 1: Figure 4: please add descriptions to x-axis.

Reply 1: We have revised the Figure 4. Please see the attachments uploaded in the article revision.

Comment 2: Please add an overview to the beginning of the legend of Figure 5,6, respectively.

Reply 2: We have added an overview to the beginning of the legend of Figure 5,6, respectively.

Comment 3: All abbreviations in figures and legends should be explained.

Reply: We have explained all abbreviations in figures and legends.