Peer Review File

Reviewer A

This manuscript is an Editorial Commentary on the paper titled 'Determinants of resistance to engineered T cell therapies targeting CD19 in large B cell lymphomas' published in Cancer Cell 2023;41(1):210-225.e5. The commentary effectively summarizes the content of the original paper and appropriately discusses both its strengths and limitations. I find little to fault in the substance of the article, but there are a few points, outlined below, that require attention and possible revision.

Comment 1. Upon reviewing your manuscript, I noticed that the statement 'while higher levels of cfCAR19 at week 4 were correlated to improved EFS' (page 6, line 156) might contain an error. Could you please confirm if it should actually read 'week 1' instead of 'week 4'?

Reply 1. We thank the Reviewer for his/her constructive comments. We confirm that "week 4" (page 6, line 156) should be replaced with "week 1".

Changes in the text. Our text has been modified as advised (see page 6, line 156).

Comment 2. Similarly, in the sentence 'a multivariable model that included ctDNA levels at week 1 and cfCAR19 levels at week 4 was built' (page 6, line 157-158), could you please confirm the accuracy of the weeks specified? It seems possible that 'week 1' should actually be 'week 4' for ctDNA levels, and 'week 4' should be 'week 1' for cfCAR19 levels.

Reply 2. As above, we agree with this comment. As pointed out by the Reviewer, 'week 1' should actually be 'week 4' for ctDNA levels, and 'week 4' should be 'week 1' for cfCAR19 levels (page 6, line 157-158).

Changes in the text. Our manuscript has been modified as suggested (see page 6, line 157-158).

Comment. This paper is an editorial commentary on a recent study concerning developing a cfDNA profiling tool to explore determinants associated with treatment response and resistance in R/R LBCL patients who received CAR-T therapy.
It effectively summarizes the critical content and provides insights and directions that can be valuable to readers.

Reply. We express our gratitude to the Reviewer for his/her kind words regarding our manuscript.

Comment. Accept without modification
The review is thorough, well written, and contextualizes the novelty of the publication being reviewed.

Reply. We give thanks to the Reviewer for his/her appreciative words in regard of our work.