Reviewer’s report

Title: An inflammation-based cumulative prognostic score system in patients with diffuse large B cell lymphoma in rituximab era

Version: 3 Date: 04 Sep 2017

Reviewer: Hao Wang

Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the clarification. I do not feel the revision has address my comments adequately.

Major comments:

First, the authors clarified that the cut-off values of the risk factors were determined based a binary overall survival endpoint. The authors defined survival status as whether a patient was alive at the end of follow-up, however, this binary survival outcome depended on the length of follow-up which varied across patient. That is, the patient who entered the study late and had a shorter follow-up time was more likely to be alive than the one who entered earlier. Therefore, the definition of outcome was not appropriate. The authors may consider survival as a time-to-event outcome for this analysis.

Second, for the evaluation of the prognostic value of ICPS and IPI risk core, I suggested an additional analysis considering two variables: ICPS and IPI risk score. Please note that the recommendation was not to include both the IPI risk score and its individual risk factors in the model. I agreed with the Reviewer #1 that the analysis should either include the IPI score or include all the factors in the IPI, but not both. The new multivariate analysis the authors performed would underestimate the importance of IPI score as the Reviewer #1 pointed out.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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