

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/abs-21-147>

Reviewer A

Comment 1: Was there a specific question or questions the authors were attempting to answer in completing their review? Identifying a question or questions that can be answered by the narrative review will improve the scientific merit and organization of the study.

Reply 1: Thanks for this comment we realized that the object of the study was not clear and added a last sentence to the Introduction in order to explain that our aim was provide a narrative review with a focus on the safety of pre-pectoral breast reconstruction (PBR) in terms of complication rate and the advantages of this procedure when compared to submuscular reconstruction. Additionally, we also analyzed evidence available on the safety of PBR in special settings: postmastectomy radiotherapy, revision surgery, skin-sparing mastectomy and hybrid reconstruction.

Changes in the text: See page 7, lines 121-126.

Comment 2: The meaning of the phrase, “above all in the first phase of the learning curve,” is unclear.

Reply 2: We agree with the reviewer. Hence, we have removed the unclear sentence as the concept is clarified later, thinking to the learning curve of PBR the adherence to ideal selection criteria is the only way to reduce the complication rate.

Changes in the text: See pages 16-17, lines 364-390

Comment 3: The paper needs to be proofread for minor grammar corrections

Reply 3: we did it.

Changes in the text: see all manuscript

Reviewer B

Comment 1: perhaps it would be pertinent to offer an opinion regarding the direction in which prepectoral reconstruction is headed. ie. will the use of meshes/matrices once again fall out of favour?

Reply 1: We provided data available at the moment, there is evidence on the use of no mesh but data, follow-up duration and sample size are promising but still limited to derive strong recommendations. Actually, we are not yet able to define whether the ADM will fall into disuse.

Changes in the text: see page 19, lines 417-422

Comment 2: more emphasis on patient selection and criteria

Reply 2: we have added a figure on the selection criteria (Figure 2)

Changes in the text: See pages 17, lines 369-390; see Fig. 2

Comment 3: minor grammatical errors throughout the paper

Reply 3: we proofread the paper

Changes in the text: see all manuscript

Reviewer C

Comment 1: The methods does not identify any outcome measures sought or any planned analysis of results.

Reply 1: We intended the paper as a narrative review with the objective of providing the reader the most recent evidence on the safety and feasibility of PBR. No analyses was planned but outcomes were summarized and the reviewed studies discussed.

Changes in the text: See page 7, lines 129-135; pages 19-20, lines 434-454

Comment 2: There are no Figures or Schematics at all - these are essential in a 'learning' piece such as this.

Reply 2: Thanks for this comment we added a figure on the selection criteria (Figure 2) and a final summary with figure (Figure 3)

Changes in the text: see Fig. 2, pages 19-20; see Fig. 3, page 19, line 434

Comment 3: The review should be in the results section not a discussion.

Reply 3: We did this correction, thanks for this suggestion.

Changes in the text: see pages 8-16

Comment 4: A discussion that succinctly puts the data into a clinically useful summary is needed

Reply 4: We added a final summary in bullet points at the end of the discussion.

Changes in the text: see pages 19-20, lines 434-454