

Peer Review File

Article Information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tcr-22-2192>

Reviewer A

Please consider to re-write the discussion section with more details on the previous studies and clarity on the objectives of your study. Few edits and formatting issues need to be addressed throughout the manuscript. In future studies a larger size of cases is recommended to confirm whether or not the combination therapy is the best efficacious and safe therapy approach.

Reply:

Dear reviewer:

Thank you for your constructive comments on my manuscript. We have carefully considered the suggestion of Reviewer and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. You could see the changes by using the "Track changes". Thymic epithelial tumor, as a rare malignancy, currently lacks the standard treatment of second-line and above-line. To clarify our study, we summarized previously-published relevant studies on immunotherapy or antiangiogenic therapy in patients with thymic tumor in Table 4. And thank you for your attention, we have carefully revised the manuscript and corrected the mistakes in article. At last, Thank you for your wonderful advice. However, the low rate of thymic tumor had limited the large number of thymic tumor patients receiving the combination of immunotherapy and antiangiogenic therapy to be involved in current study. If we have more opportunity to conduct the thymic tumor patients, the patients could be further expanded to some extent.

Reviewer B

The authors report a retrospective study of 10 patients with thymic epithelial tumors. All patients were treated with a combination of PD(L)-1 inhibitors and antiangiogenetic drugs. In general, there is a need for data on these rare entities. Regrettably, there are numerous shortcomings and weaknesses in the work presented. For example: Already in the title, the drugs used are falsely referred to as "Immune checkpoint inhibitions". Numerous linguistic errors make comprehension considerably more difficult. The graphs do not have a consistent design and are partly mislabeled (fig. 1B "progression free survival" instead of "overall survival").

The manuscript should therefore be carefully revised in terms of content and language before a technical comment can be made.

Translated with www.DeepL.com/Translator (free version)

Reply:

Dear reviewer:

Thank you for your comments and suggestion concerning our manuscript. The comments and suggestions are all valuable and very help for revising and improving our paper. We revised the whole article carefully and modified our text as advised. In addition, we consulted a professional editing service to check the language errors. We really hope that the flow and language level have been substantially improved. You can see a certificate of language editing that we submit to the editorial office. Meanwhile, we modified our graphs and figures. Thanks very much for taking your time to review this manuscript.