

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/fomm-23-5>

Sr No	Reviewer A comments	Reply
1.	the abstract must include the main findings	Included and modified the abstract pp no 2 Line no 2-20 Highlighted the text
2.	introduction should comment on other immune cell types besides T cells in the pathogenesis of OSF. This topic seems to me still needs to improve significantly	Added other immune cells and improved pls go through pp no 4 Line no. 1-5
3.	Immune system and OSCC section, the description of findings on immune cell types should be standardized according to current recommendations. For example, "CD4+ CD25 and CD127 cells" "CD3+, CD4+ T cells"	Changed accordingly Pp no - 6 Line no. -13 nd 20
4.	T cells and OSF section, the description of cell types seems inadequate. For example, is "Some dispersed CD8+ cells (suppressor/cytotoxicT lymphocytes)" suppressor correct? "CD68+ cells (macrophages and Langerhans' cells)" Langerhans cells are CD1a+/CD207+/S100+, with CD68 to be better presented...etc	Modified the text accordingly check pp no- 5 & 6 Line no 31-34 and line 1-2
5.	T cell in OSCC with background of OSF section, note that the construction of the paragraphs is still deficient	Modified accordingly Pp no -7 Line no 1-26
6.	Table 1 needs to be completed! highlight the main conclusions of these studies	Table 1 is completed and highlighted
7.	show how you selected these articles?	Mentioned in the text and in introduction part. Pp no - 4 Line no - 20-24
8.	proofread your manuscript with an English-speaking native	Done with grammerly

Sr No	Reviewer B comments	Reply
1.	<p>They used twenty-eight references, however only two articles from the last five years and thirteen articles from the last ten years. I emphasize that the number of articles from the last ten years (n=13) does not represent fifty percent of the total articles used.</p> <p>I suggest an update of the references since a search in PUBMED identified articles from 2019, 2020, 2021 and 2022 that could be used.</p> <p>Update the literature review.</p>	<p>The articles are updated as suggested and highlighted in both text and references.</p> <p>Recent study has been added in pp no-7 by Wang et al.</p> <p>Line no. - 23-27</p>
2.	<p>Insert a discussion item or when describing the findings of different authors compare ideas and suggest a hypothesis.</p>	<p>Based on the findings hypothesis is suggested in Pp no - 8</p> <p>Line no -32-34</p> <p>Separate discussion item is not inserted. Findings of different author has been described accordingly. (for example pp no. 7 in line no.-4-6)</p>
3.	<p>The conclusion of the article is not clear and does not respond to the proposed objective. I have not seen enough elements to support the idea that immune T cells and their subset can be of great prognostic value and especially in OSF can be considered as markers in malignant transformers.</p>	<p>The conclusion has been modified and some new studies are also described accordingly.</p>