

## Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/gs-23-522>

### Reviewer A

This editorial article on Diao et al. "Patient-Reported Quality of Life after Breast Conserving Surgery with Radiotherapy versus Mastectomy and Reconstruction" summarizes the main results and is complemented by 5 other recently published articles on this topic.

Comment 1:

This version is obviously not yet the final version, as a German passage appears at lines 86-88: "Und vielleicht irgendwo nochmal: in erster Linie geht es bei der OP / Mammachirurgie um onkologische Sicherheit ( inkl survival) und kosmetisch gutes und für die Pat zufriedenstellendes Ergebnis und dies bzgl LQ kurz, mittel und langfristig"

Reply1: We have removed the passage.

Changes in the text: The passage was removed.

Comment 2:

There are also a few other spelling errors that should be corrected or rephrased in the final revision.

Reply 2: We have corrected the spelling errors.

Changes in the text: The text was checked and spelling errors were corrected.

Comment 3:

Furthermore, the core statements should be more concise, and the text from line 74 onward can be condensed considerably.

Reply 3: We disagree with the reviewer. The core statements in the last paragraph are concise and clear. Furthermore we believe that the manuscript would lose its flow if it was condensed.

Changes in the text: none

### Reviewer B

there are basic major problems with this study:

Reply: This is not a study but an invited editorial on a study published by other authors. If the reviewer sees major basic problems with the study, the authors of the editorial are not the ones to address.

1. "While this has been demonstrated for all surgical approaches, the effect is more pronounced after mastectomy"- you cannot assume this by 1 reference, many surgeries cause that.

Reply 1: We do not assume this by 1 reference, the reference is just one very good example. This is not a review but an invited editorial reflecting the personal considerations of the invited authors. We believe it is more than appropriate to add a reference to a statement but to do this in an exemplary way in this setting.

2. "Young age was associated with poorer social and sexual function, as well as poorer sexual enjoyment and lower expectations of the future"- same as 1, cannot assume this is correct by one reference.

Reply 2: same comment, same answer as reply 1

3. "The new aspect in the work discussed here is that there is a difference between women younger than 50 and women older than 65 in the long-term quality of life depending on the type of surgery, with younger women being more satisfied..."- what about the 50-65? how can you ignore all other factors associated with the q

Reply 3: Obviously the reviewer was interrupted when writing this comment, that makes it a little hard to reply because we do not really know what the reviewer wanted to say. We are not "ignoring" anything but we are discussing the results of the paper we were asked to comment on. Patients in these two groups were the patients who reported the highest QoL scores that is why we focused on them.