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Reply to Editorial and Reviewers' Comments:

Editorial Comments:

The paper should be considered acceptable for publication, pending the following additional mandatory modifications:

1. The methods section in the abstract is incoherent and does not provide sufficient scientific detail to reflect the study design. Specifically, the two study groups are not described in detail. The sentence "From June 2006 (...) is incoherent and out of context. The authors should take into consideration the specific comments from the referee who re-reviewed the revised paper (see below).

Re: Thank you very much for your kindly review and nice comments, and we have added details on the time periods of the study (see LOA1).

DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS

In the paragraph Results - Clinical features:

- I would make clear that the patients of the TP group were treated between December 2005 and June 2006 while the patients of the R-TP group were enrolled between July 2006 and June 2008
- when talking about post-operative treatment, I would tell how many patients of the TP-group underwent targeted therapy, chemotherapy and supportive therapy and how many of the R-TP group underwent them.

Re: The time periods of TP and R-TP were added according to your advice (see LOA1). I'm sorry for providing less detailed information on this important issue. In the post-operative treatment, we have checked the data box and added the number of patients underwent different post-op treatments (see LOA2). Thank you very much for your suggestions.

The description of both study cohorts should be included accordingly in the methods section of the abstract. In addition, the authors should provide the exact dates of the time-window in both groups (e.g. Dec. 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006; July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2008 - as applicable).

Re: The details of time periods were added according to your advice (See LOA1). Thank you very much.

2. Numbers of values <10 should be spelled out throughout the manuscript (e.g. "two groups" instead of "2 groups", etc.)
Re: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We have checked the manuscript and made the values<10 spell out (See LOA3). We thought that it would be very helpful for our future scientific writing. Thank you again.

3. The bibliography appears outdated in large part and should be revised to include the pertinent peer-reviewed literature from the past 3-5 years as the main bulk of all citations

Re: Many thanks. We have noticed the problem in outdated references of this paper. According to your advice, we improved our citations-to have the latest peer-reviewed publications listed, and the manuscript was revised due to the added new publications (See LOA4).

List of Actions

LOA1: The time periods of both R-TP and TP were detailed.

LOA2: The number of patients underwent different post-op treatments were added.

LOA3: The values<10 were spelled out.

LOA4: The references were upgraded.