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### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors are to be complimented on their well written excellent approach, using the SEER database as an hypothesis-generating model, then applying the SEER-derived on their own institutional data. This reviewer has only minor comments: - Some abbreviations are not spelled out: DCA; MANEC. - Methods, missing definition of DSS: how was time defined? What were the events/censoring criteria? - Figure 7: missing the levels and reference level of T-stage and Marital. For the other, are their levels the same as Figure 2? - Figure 3: survival curves are provided for the SEER data, but are missing for the Test. - Consider providing the information on the overall survival of the SEER patients as compared with the authors' institution patients.