

## Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/gs-24-244>

<b>REVIEWER A</b>	
<p>Your scoping review provides valuable insights into the different regulatory approaches and their implications for patient safety and professional accountability. The comparative analysis is particularly useful in highlighting the nuances and variations between these regions. However, there are a few areas where the manuscript could benefit from further clarity and depth. Below, I have outlined some specific suggestions to enhance the overall quality and impact of your work.</p> <p>Comment 1: Overall Structure</p> <p>If we were to follow GS Journal's guidelines for scoping reviews, you need to rename the section titled "Background" to "Introduction" (Line 46, Page 3). The manuscript would benefit from improved flow and cohesion. Ensure that each section logically leads to the next. I suggest reading through the manuscript again to ensure it has a natural flow.</p>	<p>Thank you for your kind initial comments. Introduction has been revised. <b>Pag 3. Line 52.</b></p> <p>Manuscript flow and cohesion have also been revised.</p>
<p>Comment 2: Results</p> <p>Sections 3.3 to 3.8 (lines 192 to 235) are unclear regarding which country's regulations are being discussed. It seems to refer to Australia, but this should be explicitly stated. Following this, Section 3.9 titled "UK Guidelines" correctly specifies the focus on UK regulations. However, at the end of this section (lines</p>	<p>We confirm you that lines 192 to 235 were referred to Australia's regulations. This is now explicitly stated in the revised manuscript. Chapter's titles have also been renamed.</p> <p><b>p.8 line 198, p.9 line 243, p.10 line 261</b></p>

<p>254 to 257), the discussion abruptly shifts to Italy. This content should either be given a separate headline for Italy or removed from the UK section to maintain clarity.</p>	
<p>Comment 3: Table/Chart While the results section provides an overview of regulatory frameworks, it would benefit from a more structured comparison. I suggest adding a table that highlights key differences and similarities. This will make the information clearer and more accessible.</p>	<p>A Table has been included in the revised manuscript. Thank you for your review.  p.17 lines 438 -440</p>
<b>REVIEWER B</b>	
<p>The article is interesting, the topic discussed is very interesting and topical, data collection and analysis have been adequately performed. However this study has a small study sample.</p>	<p>Dear Reviewer 2, thank you for your kind initial comment. We do agree that the study sample is small. However, to the best of our knowledge, this topic is poorly explored in the present literature and there are few publications available. This is now specified in the study limitation paragraph. Thank you for your review.  <b>p. 20, line 443</b></p>
<b>REVIEWER C</b>	
<p>The authors described "Regulatory Frameworks in Plastic and Cosmetic Surgery: A Comparative Scoping Review Across Australia, the UK, and Italy" in a narrative style review. As they mentioned, the necessity for stringent regulations becomes paramount to ensure patients' safety and uphold ethical standards within the medical community. So, this topic should be informative and attractive for potential readers. However,</p>	<p>Dear reviewer 3. Thank you for your initial comment. The choice of comparing the framework regulation between Australia, UK and Italy is related to the discussion among the senior authors of daily problems of the plastic surgeon with respect to current regulations. From this assumption we have explored the topic in order to compare the differences and similarities between the legal systems.</p>

<p>I have some questions and suggestions to improve this manuscript.</p> <p>1. In Method. Why did you choose Australia, the UK and Italy? Please add the reason.</p>	<p>However, we agree that this limited focus on the 3 countries represents a limitation of the study. This is now clearly specified in the study limitation paragraph.</p> <p><b>Pag. 20, lines 447-448</b></p>
<p>2. I cannot understand Line 75,76 "from their infinity? to May 2024". Please add more details.</p>	<p>Data available until may 2024 were considered for this review. This is now specified in the revised manuscript.</p> <p><b>p. 4-line 81-82</b></p>
<p>3. This is a "review article". So, they should add more articles (e.g., more than 70 references). If there may be a few articles, other countries(e.g., US, Japan, Korea,) should be added.</p>	<p>Thank you for this observation. There is limited material available in the scientific literature on this topic. Despite this, we have increased our references, made changes to the discussion, and added an explanatory table. These improvements allow for a clearer and more comprehensive understanding of the results and their implications.</p>
<p>4. In Results. I recommend Table describing the comparison between 3 countries or more countries.</p>	<p>A table resuming results has been included.</p>
<p>5. In Discussion. They mentioned only limitation. They should search and add similar articles desribing similar contents.</p>	<p>Thank you for this observation. We have added this to the discussion.</p>