

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tcr-23-1501>

Reviewer A:

Comment 1: The reviewer suggests comparing and discussing the differences in our results with other articles on the same topic.

Reply 1: We appreciate the reviewer's suggestion. In response, we have conducted a comprehensive literature review and added a section (see Page10-11, line260-263) to the manuscript where we compare and discuss the main differences between our results and those of other relevant retrospective and prospective articles. This section provides a critical analysis of the varying outcomes in the literature and how our findings contribute to the existing knowledge base.

Additionally, we have taken your suggestion into account and have now incorporated a discussion of other inflammatory factors and their impact on the prognosis of cervical cancer patients (see Page11, line264-275). This addition provides a more comprehensive context for our findings and addresses the heterogeneity in results found in existing literature.

Comment 2: The reviewer points out repetitive use of the term "patients" in the results section and a repeated reference to Zhu et al.

Reply 2: We acknowledge the reviewer's observation. We have carefully reviewed the manuscript and removed the unnecessary repetitions of the term "patients" and corrected the reference to Zhu et al.

Reviewer B:

Comment 1: The reviewer emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between adenocarcinoma and squamous cell carcinoma populations for SCC Ag cutoff values.

Reply 1: We appreciate the reviewer's suggestion and acknowledge the oversight in not specifying the histologic cell types of the patients in our study cohort. All 190 selected patients with advanced cervical cancer had a pathological type of squamous cell carcinoma. (see Page 5, line 106-107)