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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you very much for your email and comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Postoperative chemoradiotherapy is superior to postoperative chemotherapy alone in squamous cell lung cancer patients with limited N2 lymph node metastasis” (ID: BCAN-D-19-00741R1).

We reviewed all comments carefully and revised the manuscript according to the reviewers’ comments. The followings are the responds to the reviewer’s comments.

Editor

1. Please address the below reviewer comments.

Response: Thank you very much for your suggestion! We have responded reviewer’s comments.

2. In order to be in line with journal requirements, please include the following headings within your manuscript: Background, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusions
3. In the "Availability of Data and Materials" section, please detail where the raw data supporting your findings can be found (including information found in any supplementary files). If the raw data is publicly available or can be requested, please state that this is the case, and where the data can be found/requested from. Alternatively, if you do not wish to/cannot share your data, please state (in the ‘Availability of data and Materials’ section) that data will not be shared, and state the reason.

Response: Thank you very much! Data were added in the supplement files.

4. 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 very much! We revised them in the revised manuscript.

5. Please rename your 'Conflict of Interest Statement' heading to 'Competing Interests.'

Response: Thank you very much for such suggestion! We revised them in the revised manuscript.

6. In your Author Contributions section, please detail the individual contributions of each and all authors, using their full initials.

Response: Thank you very much! We revised them in the revised manuscript.

7. Please remove from the file inventory any files you do not wish to be published alongside the manuscript.

Response: Thank you very much for such suggestion!

8. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional
files) should remain uploaded as separate files. Please ensure that all figures, tables and additional/supplementary files are cited within the text.

Response: Thank you very much for such suggestion!

Reviewer Lijun Xue (Reviewer 1):

1. The revised manuscript has been improved with some changes or explanations according to the comments and suggestions of reviewers. Personally, the conclusion may be not appropriately achieved because "there was only one patient with T4 disease after PSM" in the present series. However, as concluded by authors, "POCRT following complete resection may be beneficial ... particularly those with limited nodal involvement and T4 disease".

Response: Thank you very much for your suggestion! We correct the conclusion in the revised manuscript.

Thank you very much for your comments and suggestion!