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Dear Editor-in-Chief,

Please find enclosed a revised manuscript entitled “N/L Ratio has no predictive or prognostic value in breast cancer patients undergoing preoperative systemic therapy” by Christoph Suppan, Vesna Bjelic-Radisic, Marlen La Garde, Andrea Groselj-Strele, Katharina Eberhardt, Hellmut Samonigg, Hans Loibner, Nadia Dandachi and Marija Balic for consideration for publication in BMC Cancer. We strongly believe that we were able to address all the issues raised by reviewers and we hope that this revised manuscript is now suitable for publication. Please note that all changes made to the manuscript have been highlighted in red.

Regarding to the peer review received on 7 December 2015 we would like to give a point-by-point response to the concerns.
Reviewer: John Hughes

Ad Minor Essential Revisions

1. Median follow-up time is presented in the Methods section with a 95% CI. Can the authors please give the range instead of the 95% CI for consistency with the presentation of other medians in the article?

The estimated median follow-up time was calculated using the reverse Kaplan-Meier method according to established guidelines based on Schemper and Smith 1996. In doing this, only 95% CI values are calculated.


2. Can the authors please make clear that the numbers in brackets following medians is the range? This has not been done in all cases.

This has now been corrected.

3. A comma (, ) is still used as the separator for decimal places in Table 4. Can the authors please ensure that a full stop (.) is used.

This has been corrected

Herewith we hope that we have addressed all the issues raised by the reviewers sufficiently.

Sincerely yours,
Christoph Suppan

Corresponding Author: Marija Balic, MD, PhD, Assoc. Prof.; Division of Oncology, Department of Internal Medicine, Medical University of Graz, Auenbruggerplatz 15, 8036 Graz, Austria;