

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/ales-23-29>

Reviewer A

The article is of excellent quality. It is a very important topic for the scientific community. The small points I suggest improving are:

- Present an international overview of the theme in the introduction (what was done similarly in other countries, or even what was not done);

Thank you for your comment. We have incorporated the characteristics of how doctors in different regions read medical literature into the introduction section. Reading literature is a crucial means to stay updated on the latest medical advancements, and this practice is consistent worldwide.

- Improve the practical implications of the study (How important is the study for society? How important is the study for professionals? How important is the study for the health system? Etc..)

Thanks for your kind comments. We have added some sentences to clarify the importance of reading methodologically. "For the surgical community, health care professionals and the health care system in general: to obtain information that is methodologically sound and critical is essential to provide the best possible care (and do no harm) for our patients."

Reviewer B

The authors have done good work by putting this together. Well done.

Few observations:

1. Is this an Editorial or Expert opinion, or a review, or a book chapter? The article seems very unstructured and not easy to follow by readers. It is advisable to break it into sections and subsections.

Thank you for your comments. We have divided the content of the manuscript and added subheadings to each section.

2. The article has summarized mostly concepts that are already known in textbooks, or already widely documented. Hence, it will be good if the article can focus more on things that are novel/scholarly rather than just re-echoing/re-publishing things already known. If this was a book chapter, then this article will fit nicely (as a teaching tool).

Obtaining updated and evidence-based information from the current medical literature is essential for effective patient management. Yet, the vastness of the literature poses a challenge, as it encompasses a myriad of information that varies widely in quality and usefulness. In this manuscript, we discuss a systematic approach to the critical appraisal of medical literatures.

3. The methodology of the article needs to be shown (even if its a narrative or general review article). It should include things like Search strategy, PICO question (if possible), search terms, and list of databases used.

As there are no specific recommendations in the EQUATOR guidelines, we basically inspired our search methodology the PRISMA guidelines. It is difficult to describe the strategy in narrative reviews: narrative reviews have no predetermined research question or specified search strategy, only a topic of interest, and therefore there are no clear guidelines of how to conduct them, as is the case for systematic reviews. While systematic reviews answer a narrow question through thorough and comprehensive literature searches, narrative reviews are more descriptive. The authors can express their own or others' subjective perspectives on a focused but broader topic. It might be better to call our paper a "critical review". But still there is no preset protocol.

4. The article does not have a conclusion section.

We have organized the content and added a conclusion section.

Overall, I like the fact that the article brought together a lot of salient points that are often ignored when interpreting research work. Other comments can be found highlighted in the pdf document.

Thank you for your detailed comments. We have made revisions based on your annotations in the PDF file. Additionally, we have added subheadings to enhance the readability of the article.