

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/ales-22-67>

Reviewer A

Comment 1: There are multiple grammar issues present within the manuscript, particularly the need for commas to break up the text. I suggest rereading the manuscript for grammatical errors.

Reply 1: We thoroughly reread the manuscript and adapted grammatical errors throughout the manuscript.

Changes in the text: Page 3, lines 37, 40, 43, 47-49, 51. Page 4, lines 60-61, 79-80. Page 5, lines 85, 88-91, 98-100, 104-106. Page 6, lines 113, 118, 123, 126-127. Page 7, lines 132-133, 136-139, 144-145, 148-149, 152, 154-155. Page 8, lines 157, 159-160, 162, 164-165, 167-168, 170, 177-181. Page 9, lines 182-183, 187, 196-202, 204-206. Page 10, lines 207-209, 213-214, 217, 222, 224, 230. Page 11, line 236

Comment 2: The topic you discuss is an important one.

The introduction is quite limited. You state there is no consensus regarding several aspects of perioperative care, but it would be good to provide justification for this statement and write about what information is conflicting.

Reply 2: We do agree with the reviewer that the introduction was quite limited.

Therefore, we extended the information in the introduction regarding lack of consensus on type of pleurodesis, analgesic technique and chest tube management by discussing the associated evidence as suggested by the reviewer.

Changes in the text: Page 4, line 63-77

Comment 3: Line 87 - 45 not forty-five

Reply 3: Although generally a sentence does not start by a written number, we adjusted this in accordance with the advice of the reviewer.

Changes in the text: Page 6, line 111

Comment 4: Line 96- It is insufficient to say it varied widely - more information is required. How did it vary?

Reply 4: We now added the exact numbers to demonstrate the exact variation as requested by the reviewer.

Changes in the text: Page 6, line 119

Comment 5: Discussion raises some great points.

Although the topic is an interesting one, I would suggest major revision as the style of academic writing is poor and needs revision.

Reply 5: We want to thank reviewer A for his/her advise on the manuscript. We do agree that this is a very interesting topic. As suggested we revised our manuscript and changed grammatical errors (see comment 1).

Reviewer B

Comment 1: Interesting topic. Would be interesting to see how and if surgeons alter their response if case was pediatric in nature. With that said, I believe this is suitable to accept as publication.

Reply 1: We thank reviewer B for his positive reply. Regarding the responses of our participants in case our survey was based on a pediatric case, we can state that our survey was only sent to all (cardio)thoracic surgeons in the Netherlands. Therefore, we are not informed by responses of pediatric surgeons, as only one single pediatric surgeon in the Netherlands is also registered as thoracic surgeon.