Peer Review File

Round 1
Comment 1: The authors discuss a meta-analysis performed in studies evaluating PD-L1 staining and prognostic factors such as OS, IPI, performance status and tendency to treatment response. The meta analysis evaluated multiple variables and also went over the limitations in the study such of lack of standardization of the stains used as well as lack of standardization in the percentage reported. This is known to be an important factor in the interpretation of PD-L1 in other tissues, and may impact response to immune checkpoint inhibitors. I would recommend the authors to better describe the importance of standardization of immunostains and interpretation in PD-L1. This is definitely one of the main issues in this type of study. **Reply 1:** Thank you for your very considerate advice. We accept the comment, and added some explanations in the discussion section.
Changes in the text: see page 10 line 268.

Comment 2: Issues were seen throughout the manuscript. There were several grammar mistakes, including fragmented sentences, and words that did not appear to match the context. For example, in the introduction, ...target lesions have been continuously performed,.. relapsed or refractory." The whole sentence seems confusing and difficult to understand. At some point there is lack of conciseness, and fragmented sentences (e.g. Nevertheless, no control group is the deficiency). I believe the word predictive and predictive value may be used with the intent to describe prognosis and this needs to be revised by the authors.
Reply 2: Thank you for construction comments. We have modified our text as advised.
Changes in the text: see page 2 line 49, page 3 line 65-67 and line 78, page 7 line 108, page 9 line 247, page 11 line 283-287.

Round 2
Comment: The authors addressed some points of the review. However, there are still corrections to address—the lack of immunostaining standardization needs to be discussed further. My suggestion to the authors would be to include this not only for PDL1 but also in general. This is a challenge in any immunostaining grading and quantification.
Grammar and syntax still need significant work, and editing by a native English speaker is recommended.

Reply 1: Thank you for your very considerate advice. We modified the explanations in the discussion section which we hope meet with approval. In addition, Based on suggestion, we have completed English language editing. Editing Certificate is attached

in the Email.
Changes in the text: see page 10-11, line 444-463.