PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Predictability of Recurrence using Immunohistochemistry to delineate Surgical Margins in mucosal Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma (PRISM - HNSCC): Study protocol for a prospective, observational and bilateral study in Australia and India
AUTHORS	Joseph, Sheela; Janakiraman, Rajinikanth; Chacko, Geeta; Jayaraj, Rama; Thomas, Mahiban; Thomas, Meera; Mukhopadhyay, Sramana

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER REVIEW RETURNED	Justin Bishop The Johns Hopkins University, USA 08-Dec-2016
GENERAL COMMENTS	Nicely designed study. One thing that should be addressed is that the interpretation of p53 and IF4E is not always so straightforward, especially in the setting of normal-appearing mucosa. Strict interpretation criteria should be given, ideally accompanied by photomicrographs illustrating a positive and negative (and perhaps an equivocal) case.

REVIEWER	Panagiota Economopoulou Attikon University Hospital
	Greece
REVIEW RETURNED	23-Apr-2017
GENERAL COMMENTS	Please correct grammar and mistakes
	Please clearly specify the number of patients that will participate in
	the study
	Please specify the inclusion criteria

REVIEWER	Dr Omar Breik
	Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery Unit
	Royal Melbourne Hospital
	Melbourne, Victoria, Australia
REVIEW RETURNED	23-Jul-2017
GENERAL COMMENTS	This is a well designed project aiming to answer some important questions in relation to margin clearance in head and neck SCCs.

The use of VELoscope and lugol's iodine in the Vellore patients
would be ideal, but not having this information available still makes
for an interesting comparison of outcomes. I look forward to seeing
the results of this study once recruitment and follow up is completed.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1 - Justin Bishop

Thanks for the comments on the design of the study. I agree interpretation of immunohistochemistry may not always be straight forward. Standardisation and interpretation particularly with e IF4E has been quite a challenge. After several attempts we have just managed to standardise the stain for e IF4E antibody. Since I live in Australia I work on the research project in India only during periodic visits. I am yet to complete the staining of the cases selected for Immunohistochemistry. Hence I will be grateful if the photomicrographs of the positive controls with a description of the interpretation is acceptable to you at this stage, particularly as this is a protocol paper. I hope to include photomicrographs of the margins and results in a subsequent paper describing the outcomes of the research. I will at that time discuss the interpretation of the immunostained sections in greater detail.

Reviewer: 2 - Panagiota Economopoulou

Thank you for the comments. I noticed quite a few spelling and grammar mistakes. I have attempted to address that in the revised version of the manuscript. I have elaborated on the inclusion criteria as below:

•All patients at the Royal Darwin Hospital and Christian Medical College Vellore during the recruitment period with a confirmed diagnosis of mucosal head and neck squamous cell carcinoma on initial biopsy.

•Wide local excision biopsy with mucosal surgical margins ≥5mm on histopathological examination. Addition to exclusion criteria:

•Patients who undergo postoperative radiotherapy

I have given an approximate number of around 50 participants; 6-8 from Darwin and 40- 45 from Vellore.

Reviewer: 3 Dr Omar Breik

Thank you for the comments. I hope to complete the project soon and look forward to disseminating some useful results that can be applied in the clinical setting.