

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tcr-23-697>

Reviewer A

1. **Comments:** I suggest a round of language revision, in order to correct few typos and improve readability.

Reply: Thanks for your suggestion. We have tried our best to polish the language in the revised manuscript. Here we did not list the changes but marked in the revised paper. We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers' warm work earnestly and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

2. **Comments:** It would be interesting to discuss results of this study in the scenario of the current molecular classification and recent evidence present in the literature of endometrial cancer. Referring to PMID: 36833105 and 36979434.

Reply: We sincerely appreciate the valuable comments. We have checked the literature carefully and added more references in the revised manuscript. Here we did not list the changes but marked in the revised paper.

Reviewer B

1. **Comments:** English language should be revised by a native speaker.

Reply: Thanks for your suggestion. We have tried our best to polish the language in the revised manuscript, and we accept the extensive language editing if necessary.

2. **Comments:** Author should revise the citation style in accordance with the one requested by the Journal.

Reply: Thanks for your suggestion. We have revised the citation style as required.

3. **Comments:** Introduction: Authors should cite the latest European (ESGO/ESTRO/ESP 2020)/American (NCCN 2020) guidelines for endometrial carcinoma when writing about prognostic factors of this cancer.

Reply: As suggested by the reviewer, we have cited the latest European (ESGO/ESTRO/ESP 2020)/American (NCCN 2020) guidelines to support this idea.

4. **Comments:** Authors should be more detailed about the description of data extraction and analysis.

Reply: Thanks for your suggestion. We describe the database used in detail in the article, and some data extraction used in R package, the detailed extraction code can be obtained from the author.

5. **Comments:** The discussion should include those recent findings in order to make the article more modern and praiseworthy

Reply: Thanks for your suggestion. we have added more references in the discussion part (PMID: 35078650; PMID: 31444708).

6. **Comments:** Authors should include a section describing strengths and limitations of this study.

Reply: Thanks for your suggestion. We have added this part according to the Reviewer's suggestion.