Peer Review File

Review Comments

Comment 1: It is difficult to determine whether this paper is about literature review, systematic review of narrative review. the methods used to write the present paper and the criteria followed by the authors to write this review should be clearly stated.

Reply 1: dear reviewer, Thank you for bringing this concern to our attention. We appreciate your thorough review of our manuscript. In response to your feedback, we have made the necessary revisions. A new paragraph has been included under the "Methods" section, as well as a supplementary file titled "Supplement Table - Search Strategy." These additions align with the journal's criteria and enhance the transparency of our **literature review**.

Change in text 1: see added content in:

word file: pages 5-6, lines 96-116, including table 1

Redline file: page 5-6, lines 96-116, including table 1.

Comment 2: line 203 table: no mention of follow up time.

Reply 2: We have taken your feedback into consideration and addressed the concern. In tables 2, 3, and 4, we have now included the follow-up time for each study included. This addition provides greater clarity and context to our findings.

Change in text 2: added rows under the title – "Average follow up time – in month" in:

word file: table 2 (pages 11-13, lines 216), table 3 (pages 15-17, line 254), and table 4 (pages 19-20, line 299)

Redline file: table 2 (pages 11-13, lines 246), table 3 (pages 15-17, line 296), and table 4 (pages 20-21, line 366)

Comment 3: level of evidence of the included papers in both tables are not written.

Reply 3: As per the criteria outlined by the journal, our manuscript is a narrative review where specifying the level of evidence is not a requirement. We have ensured that our submission aligns with the journal's guidelines and expectations.

Your input has been instrumental in enhancing the quality of our manuscript. We appreciate your thorough evaluation and valuable suggestions.

Article is well written and I congrats the authors for the work.

Comment 1: The article gives a nice overview of current treatments in BCRL. As a suggestion I think adding a part on preventive LVA may make the article complete.

Reply 1: We appreciate your supportive review. After careful consideration, we believe that incorporating a section on preventive LVA would extend beyond the scope of our manuscript. Our paper is dedicated to reviewing "combined" surgical interventions for existing BCRL, and our focus remains on this specific topic. Preventive or prophylactic measures fall outside the intended scope of our work.

Comment 2: A Material & Methods section on how the review was conducted and how table 1, 2 & 3 were composed because now it seems a bit arbitrary.

Reply 2: dear reviewer, Thank you for bringing this concern to our attention. We appreciate your thorough review of our manuscript. In response to your feedback, we have made the necessary revisions. A new paragraph has been included under the "Methods" section, as well as a supplementary file titled "Supplement Table - Search Strategy." These additions align with the journal's criteria and enhance the transparency of our narrative review.

Change in text 2: see added content in:

word file: pages 5-6, lines 96-116, including table 1

Redline file: page 5-6, lines 96-116, including table 1.

Comment 3: I would not call this a 'novel' approach but rather 'our personal' approach.

Reply 3: we have deleted the word "Novel".

Change in text 3: The word was deleted from:

word file: page 21, line 320

Redline file: page 22, line 388

You present a fairly complete review of the literature. Some key points are missing.

Comment 1: First there are no mentions on the location of the vlnt flap other than the Barcelona

cocktail algorithm. There's still some controversy regarding flap positioning for advanced cases. Please add a paragraph and some references. this should be contemplated on the algorithm.

Reply 1: Thank you for your feedback. We have included a paragraph on recipient site selection for the lymph node flap and updated the legend of the algorithm accordingly in our revised manuscript. We did not include the phrase or abbreviation of "S.R – Scar release" in the algorithm image itself because of the visual overload of details.

Your input has been instrumental in improving the clarity and completeness of our work.

Change in text 1:

Word file: pages 9-10, lines 179-199. Algorithms figure legend has been modified – figure 5, page 23, line 361.

Redline file: page 9-10, lines 179-214. Algorithms figure legend has been modified – figure 5, page 24, line 430.