I always like to do a summary (just like for a review of a paper) so I remember what I read and people know what I understood. Summary: the paper is about comparing different ways of calculating AUC and concordance for prediction of time to event outcomes. More specifically, about pointing out issues with the semiparametric approach to calculate these quantities. The paper also proposes a nonparametric approach, through a smoothing method, to address of the concerns with the semiparametric and nonparametric methods.

The paper is interesting and has good content on the issues of why the current approaches do not work well, and a proposal that addresses those issues.

Suggestions:

1. A better way to frame the paper might be as a comparison of approaches. The paper might be too negative as it is now; it feels that it is quite focused on pointing out issues and not highlighting solutions. As a comparison paper you can still point out the shortcomins of each approach. When you discuss limitations you can dive into the reasons of why. This would also be a fair assessment of the approaches, just trying to point out the advantages and disadvantages of each method.  This would still include your proposal as one more method you are comparing.
2. Alternatively to 1) you could also frame it in terms of your proposed methodology and maybe title it as “A robust AUC approach to calculate …” and compare to the other methods. Pointing out the issues with the other methods would make the case of why your proposal is needed (shortcomings in certain scenarios).  I think I might like 1) better and I think it could be a really good paper because the main AUC paper on this has been cited quite a bit (paper from Heagerty). I suspect there might eb a lot of interest in this comparison paper.
3. A few other minor comments:
   1. Hard to see the figures in b/w
   2. In the data example, can you show that the chosen models make sense for the data and that they are not influencing the overall results? My concern is that how do you know that the reason why the current approach don’t work that well is because you have chosen a good model; if you could show some evidence of this, it’d be great.
   3. In the data analysis, would there be any indication that perhaps the model is overfitting so that the semiparametric model should not be used blindly?
   4. The paper feels very biased towards showing the semiparametric approach is bad and maybe this is not quite fair, if for example there are cases in which it works well. It might be helpful to discuss when/in which scenarios each approach will likely be ok.