Reviewer's report 1

This retrospective study by Gupta et al. investigates the prognostic significance of SGA in ovarian cancer. The study represents original work and is methodologically sound. This paper is overall clear and well written. The statistical methodology used is appropriate and has all the right elements needed. I have the following suggested revisions to make the paper more robust and more informative.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. The introduction, although well written, has a missing paragraph on the statement of objective/purpose. Please insert a paragraph at the end of the introduction section describing a 1-2 line rationale and goal of this study.

2. Was informed consent of the patients or their families taken for this study? Please explain.

3. Under the results section, I would suggest including a table describing the median survival and 95% CIs for different classes of people such as those newly diagnosed, early stage, well nourished AND those previously treated, late stage, malnourished AND other different combinations using these 3 variables.

THESE COMMENTS SEEM TO PERTAIN TO A DIFFERENT PAPER.

Reviewer's report 2

I have a couple of minor revisions to suggest.

1. Table 1B is not really needed. Please talk about the results described in the table in text format under the results section. AS SUGGESTED, TABLE 1B HAS BEEN DELETED FROM THE REVISED PAPER. THE RESULTS FROM THAT TABLE ARE ALREADY DESCRIBED IN THE TEXT UNDER THE RESULTS
SECTION.

2. The non-normal distribution of age at diagnosis, BMI, and weekly milligrams intake of genistein and daidzein could be a result of relatively small sample size. This point needs to be mentioned in the discussion section. THANKS, WE HAVE INCLUDED THIS POINT UNDER THE DISCUSSION SECTION.