

## Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/gc-22-608>

### Reviewer A

**Editor Note: We found the comments of reviewer A are irrelevant. So, the authors can just ignore these comments. We mainly aim to show all the comments to the authors transparently.**

This is an interesting piece and certainly a pertinent topic.

This has been submitted as a review piece, but is structured as an editorial. A major overhaul of the layout would much improve the piece.

Some thoughts to improve this for publication are:

- structured abstract needed
- methods section essential - aims? review approach? outcome measures?
- results section needed including an assessment of the quality of the literature
- the conclusion needs to actually reflect what the review identified. It is not a further opinion section.

Reply: Understood.

### Reviewer B

The article is not meant to present new findings or a patient series, but rather to provide a coherent review of established practice guidelines regarding perioperative measures in autologous breast reconstruction. Stemming from a high volume academic surgical center, you are able to give valuable insight regarding the most relevant aspects of this common yet complex procedure, and, also, you put the most recent publications regarding this matter into context. This includes preoperative evaluation and planning, intraoperative pearls, as well as post-operative pain control and safety measures. As such, the manuscript serves not only the reconstructive microsurgeon but also the broader readership.

In conclusion, I believe the paper nicely summarizes up to date information surrounding the topic of autologous breast reconstruction and would be of value to the readership of your journal. It is well written and coherent, but would likely benefit from more illustration or tables to enhance its readability.

Reply: Understood. We held off from illustration as the different topics vary in their ability to be illustrated, we considered tables but felt they would be redundant relative to the text. We can certainly integrate tables if required by the reviewer. Thank you for your appraisal of the work.

**Reviewer C**

The authors have written a comprehensive and thorough review of the advances in perioperative care that is a welcome additional to the literature on this topic.

Reply: Understood. Thank you for your review of the work.