# Point-by-point reply to the reviewer comments

“Support Vector Machines for Survival Analysis with R”

## Main Reviewer

> For the description of SVM they wondered if a couple of the usual fit/margin diagrams > could be useful to facilitate understanding of the approach. Also, in describing survival > models in general they suggest that it would be useful to have a simple real world example > with sample data to describe the task: "This would make it simpler to gain an understanding > of the problem and the algorithm."

Response here …

Additional comment…

> They would very much have liked to replicate the experiments that you presented. Is a > script available to replicate the “Real data application. . . ” including downloading the > datasets and generating the results table and plots? That would be useful.

Response here…

Additional comment…

> On Page 4 , Section “Example of usage”: they ask about the choice 120 as the size of the > training dataset and if it is better to choose a specified proportion instead? They have > familiarity with the common choice of round(0.7\*n) and believe mentioning that or > motivating your choice is important.

Response here

Additional comment…

> They installed from

> CRAN <https://cloud.r-project.org/src/contrib/survivalsvm_0.0.3.tar.gz> and got different

> output from the print() at the botoom of page 4. You should list your version number so that > people can play at home, should they choose.

Response here

Additional comment

> Further, the have "In fact, I think the output here is not actually generated from the same > model you just built - it says subset=NULL yet the call actually has subset=train.index, > which is correctly reported when I run the commands.  Also, I do not see [sgf.sv](http://sgf.sv/)= onwards

> reported from the print()."

Reponse here…

Additional comment

> On Page 5: They point out that `print(ored.survsvm.reg)` should add an extra “\n” after the > predicted risk ranks to place the R prompt on a new line, not at the end of the line listing the > ranks. Also, they ask how significant is the precision of the numbers printed by default.

> Suggesting it would be less distracting to round these to perhaps just 2 significant digits in

> printing, unless the default precision is significant?

Response here…

Additional comment

> They thought Figure 1 layout could be improved - 3x2?

Response here…

Additional comment

## Minor Grammatical suggestions

> Page 1, Section“Introduction”, Para 1, Line 1, insert “the” in “event as the dependent > variable”.

Response here…

> Page 1, Section“Introduction”, Para 1, Line 4, replace “and” with “or”.

Response here…

> Page 1, third to last line of text, would it be better to replace “right” with “correct”? I > thought left/right at first!

Response here

> Page 2, Para 2, Line 4, insert “the” into “as the ranking”.

Response here

> Page 4, Section “Example of usage”, Line beginning “First, we split”: replace “in” with “into”.

Response here