

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/cco-22-118>

Reviewer A

Overall, a nice review on an emerging hot topic.

1) Minor comments:

Title - I think the word "more" should be removed.

Reply: thank you- we removed this word in the revised manuscript

Changes in the text: "more" is removed from the title

2) There is a discussion of PIPAC, but this does not seem to be appropriate for this review that focuses on MIS and specifically wants to emphasize robotic techniques for HIPEC. If you want to include PIPAC, then I think the title and abstract should be altered to reflect better the content of the review.

Reply: thank you- we wanted to illustrate this relatively new technique however we will adopt your suggestion

Changes in the text: the PIPAC part was erased in the revised manuscript

Reviewer B

1) There are several problematic points in this article: on the one hand, we don't know if it's a review or a feedback and mixing the two makes the article not very clear.

Reply: thank you for your comment- this article is an invited by the journal narrative review that gives our perspective in an emerging field of HIPEC as experts in the field

2) On the other hand, the review is not exhaustive, there are only data without confidence intervals or p-values which do not enable to know if the results are significant or not. There is a real screening of the articles upstream and the conclusions drawn from it are therefore biased.

Reply: Thank you for your constructive criticism. This article is not a systematic review and meta-analysis. Currently there is not good amount of published data to perform such a review. The current review summarizes the existing significant literature on the topic and gives our perspectives as experts in the field. But we agree that the existing literature has patient selection bias and to better illustrate this in the revised article we added the p values where a comparison is made in the text and added a sentence in the Summary paragraph.

Changes in the text: Please see p-values on paragraph " Open versus Minimally

Invasive Cytoreduction with HIPEC”

Also please see the new sentence “ There is obvious selection bias in the existing reports on minimally invasive CRS/HIPEC, mainly on selecting patients with very low PCI.”