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Title: Nutritional assessment and prognosis of oral cancer patients: A large-scale prospective study

Dear Prof. Tomoki Nakamura,
We are sincerely grateful for your editorial efforts and suggestions for our manuscript and the reviewers for their constructive comments which are very helpful for improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our research.

We have studied comments carefully and have made and uploaded a clean version that does not include track changes or highlighting, and made point-by-point responses to the reviewers’ comments and suggestions.

We hope these modifications and responses are satisfactory and look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you and best regards.

Sincerely yours,

Baochang He, Ph.D.

Department of Epidemiology and Health Statistics,
School of Public Health,
Fujian Medical University,
Fuzhou, Fujian 350108
P.R China
E-mail: hbc517@163.com

For Technical Comments:

Question 1. We note that author Jing Wang is included in the manuscript author list but is absent from the author list on our submission system - please ensure that this is corrected and the author lists for the manuscript and on our system match.

Answer: We are very sorry to make this mistake. We will carefully verify and revise the list of authors on the submission system, and ensure that all authors list on the manuscript are consistent with that on the system when submitting the revised manuscript.

Question 2. Please add a “Conclusions” section after the “Discussion” section. This should state clearly the main conclusions of the research article and give a clear explanation of their importance and relevance.

Answer: Many thanks for the editor’s constructive suggestion. We have added a “Conclusions” section after the “Discussion” section, and enlarged the conclusions section with future perspective of this study (Conclusions section, line 12-14, page 14).
Question 3. 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.

Answer: We have added the corresponding description about the role of the funding bodies (Funding section, line 16-17, page 15).

Question 4. Please acknowledge anyone who contributed towards the article who does not meet the criteria for authorship including anyone who provided professional writing services or materials. Authors should obtain permission to acknowledge from all those mentioned in the Acknowledgements section.

If there are no acknowledgements, please state “Not applicable”.

Answer: We have added the Acknowledgements section in the manuscript (Acknowledgements section, line 18-9, page 14).

Question 5. Please ensure that all Supplemental tables are titled correctly and referred to in the manuscript text correctly - currently there are references to Supplemental Tables 5 and 6 whereas in the supplementary materials there are only four tables.

Answer: Thanks for the carefulness of the editor. We have carefully checked the Supplemental tables and uploaded a correct version to the system.

Question 6. 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.

Answer: We have made and uploaded a clean version that does not include track changes or highlighting. Besides, we have ensured that all figures, tables and additional/supplementary files were cited within the text.

For Reviewer #1:

Question 1. please on keyword section use Medical subject headings words (MeSH) https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search

Answer: Many thanks for the reviewer’s suggestion. We have already corrected the keyword section use Medical subject headings words.
Question 2. In introduction section please specify AIM and BACKGROUND into two subsections, and better clarify primary aim of this study and secondary outcomes.

In intro section please enlarge notes on why You choose (BMI), (ALB), (PNI) and (NRI).

Answer: Because of the format requirement of the journal, a Background section is required instead of the Introduction section. We introduced the background of the study in paragraphs 1-3 and the aim of study in the fourth paragraph separately in the Background section. And we also clarified the primary aim of this study and secondary outcomes as suggested (Background section, line 6-11, page 5). Additionally, we have enlarged notes on why we choose BMI, ALB, PNI and NRI in the Background section (Background section, line 15-21, page 4 and line 1-11, page 5).

Question 3. Please subdivide results section. You should make a Sample paragraph (with patients informations), a synthesis of results for main outcome and an additional analysis for secondary outcomes (if needed)

Answer: Sorry for the confusion made in the results section. Some additional analysis were added in the manuscript as recommended by previous reviewers, which to some extent compromised the logic of the Results section. We reorganized the Results section as suggested, and divided into three parts: a Sample paragraph (with patients information), synthesized results for main outcome, synthesized results for secondary outcomes (Results section, page 8-10).


Answer: We have added reference 1 to the Discussion section as suggested (Discussion section, line 4-5, page 11). Reference 2 is mainly about periodontal disease which is of limited relevant to the current study.

Question 5. Please enlarge conclusion section with future perspective of this study.

Answer: Thanks for the suggestion. A brief description of the future perspective of this study was added in the Conclusions section. (Conclusions section, line 12-14, page 14).