

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/cco-23-26>

Reviewer A

Comment: The article should follow the attached guidelines/checklist for reporting standards. Please revise the article following the attached reporting checklist and provide it as an additional file.

Thank you for your suggestion. We revised the article following the PRISMA checklist, which, in fact, was very helpful in supplementing the text with some insights. In particular:

- Type of information collected for each study selected for systematic review (lines 130-131).
- The assessment of the included studies risk of bias (lines 132-134 and Figures 2 and 3).
- Information regarding “Registration and Protocol” and “Funding” (lines 222-226).

Reviewer B

1. PD-1 should be defined upon first use in the Main Text.

Authors response: OK

2. Figures should be cited consecutively in the Main Text. Currently, Figure 7 is cited right after Figure 5 without Figure 6 cited in between. Please revise.

Authors response: This is a matter of controversy because there is one sentence where we state “see below Appendix 2 and Figure 5” where it is questionable to establish whether Figure 5 is meant to be cited for the first time in that sentence or is actually cited “below” in the subsequent sentence where the “true” citation is reported. To fix this issue, we have renumbered all figures: those cited in the two Appendixes are now denoted as Figure A1 and Figure A2. .

3. Figure 1

The numbers in the figure should be double-checked.

Authors response: OK

4. The spelling of Rodriguez-Abreu et al. is different in Figure 3 and the bibliography. Please check which one is correct,

Authors response: OK

5. Where Name+et al appears in both Appendixes and Figure 7, reference numbers should be added.

Authors response: OK

6. All the abbreviations in the figure(s), table(s) and appendix(es) should be defined in the explanatory legend.

Authors response: OK