

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/abs-21-150>

Reviewer A

Comment 1: The paper needs thorough linguistic revision.

Reply 1: Thank you for suggestion, a linguistic revision has been made in all the manuscript

Comment 2: Moreover, a review paper on implant based breast reconstruction or any breast reconstruction for that matter must include at least a smaller paragraph on per-operative imaging, as the prerequisite for a successful immediate breast reconstruction is a nipple-or skin sparing mastectomy with viable skin flaps. Several review papers including meta-analyses have shown the for instance the use of indocyanine-green angiography is far superior to clinical evaluation.

Reply 2: Thank you for suggestion; we added a paragraph on pre-operative imaging after indications' paragraph.

Comment 3: Moreover, the paper would benefit a smaller paragraph on the oncologic safety of NSM or SSM. And please use this words in stead of conservative mastectomy, as this word may be confusing.

Reply 3: Thank you for suggestion; we added a paragraph on oncological safety of NSM and SSM. Moreover, the term "conservative mastectomy" has been corrected in all manuscript.

Reviewer B

Comment 1: In chapter 2: "High body mass index, history of smoking, scleroderma and pre operative radiation are risk conditions for implant loss": please add several references and quantitative risk (Odds Ratio). Also for "Implant removal is generally necessary in 5.1% of cases": several references required.

Reply 1: Thank you for suggestion; new references have been added.

Comment 2: In Chapter 4: "By this point of view, the need for total sub-muscular coverage ... acellular dermal matrices and biological or synthetic meshes": There is only one reference for synthetic non resorbable mesh; please add references.

Reply 2: Thank you for suggestion; new references have been added.

Comment 3: It is an interesting topic and an important question for IBR. However, even for a narrative review more numbers and rates results should be presented with a major recommendation to include Tables which summarized the main results.

Reply 2: Thank you for suggestion; now we reported rates results of cited studies.

Comment 4: In conclusion: "This technique appears to be safe, reliable, and a promising reconstructive option for selected patients, with equivalent results to other reconstructive possibilities". Selected patients? Who? Different for prepectoral and subpectoral?

Reply: Thank you for suggestion; we changed the sentence to clarify the sense of paragraph.