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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

On behalf of my co-authors, we thank you very much for giving us the constructive comments and suggestions on our manuscript entitled “Preoperative systemic inflammation score (SIS) is superior to neutrophil to lymphocyte ratio (NLR) as a predicting indicator in patients with esophageal squamous cell carcinoma” (ID: BCAN-D-19-01362 R2). These comments are all valuable and helpful for revising and improving our paper. The concerns raised by the editor and reviewers are listed below, followed by a point to point response to them. We hope the revised manuscript would meet your expectations.

Responds to the reviewer’s comments:

Reviewer 1:

Comment 1: Please ensure that the abstract contains only the following headings: Background, Methods, Results and Conclusions.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have collected the abstract according to your suggestion (Abstract, page 2-3).

Comment 2: In the section 'Funding', please also describe the role of the funding body/bodies in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.
Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have described the role of the funding according to your suggestion (Funding section, paragraph 1, page 19).

Comment 3: In your 'Author Contributions' section, please detail the contributions of each individual author, using the author's full initials.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have detailed the contribution of each individual author (Authors’ contribution statement, paragraph 3, page 19).

Comment 4: Please amend this file to address this issue, by providing ages as age-ranges, or removing the age information.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have removed the age information (Supplementary files).

Comment 5: Please also add a section “Supplementary files” where you list the following information about your supplementary material:

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have supplemented the “Supplementary files” in the revised manuscript (Supplementary files section, paragraph 4, page19-20).

Comment 6: Table 4 appears to be missing from the 'Table Legends' section - please ensure this is included.

Response: We apologize for our mistake. We have supplemented the Table legend in the revised manuscript (Table legend section, page 25).

We are very grateful to the reviewer for improving this manuscript.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper.

We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval. Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

Sincerely,

Jiancheng Li, MD, PhD