

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/med-21-31>

Review comments

Reviewer A

- First, in the background of abstract, please briefly and clearly indicate why there is a need for this review topic. The method of abstract is too simple, and we cannot assess whether the literature retrieved is up-to-date and comprehensive. Please briefly describe the search strategies and results of literature search. In the conclusion, please add some comments on limitations of existing studies and suggestions on future research topics to address these issues.

Reply 1

We agree with the reviewer A, so we have specified the need of this topic review and the objectives in the abstract. We also clarify the literature search in the abstract methods. We add some comments in the conclusions, suggesting future research topics.

Changes in text:

See Abstract page 2 line 27-55

- Second, in the introduction section of the main text, it remains unclear why the authors had this review topic and the clinical significance of this review.

Reply 2

As suggested by the reviewer the review topic and its clinical significance was specified in the introduction (Background.), also the main objective of the paper were better explained (Objectives).

Changes in text

See page 4 line 94-105 and page 4 line 106-112

- Third, as I mentioned above, details of literature search and search results are needed.

Reply 3

Details of literature search and search results were better detailed in the Methods section.

Changes in text

See page 4-5 line 113-121

- Forth, the authors reviewed several studies in the main text, but summarizing only is inadequate. Please consider to comment on limitations of previous studies, including methodology and clinical research design.

Reply 4

A comment on limitations and main features of the mentioned studies have been performed, both in the paragraph concerning the Lung ART trial and in the paragraph concerning the use of PORT before ESMO 2020. Important aspects reviewed were methodology and research design as suggested by the reviewer.

Changes in text

See page 6 line 172-184 and page 8 line 227-237

- Finally, in the conclusion section, please have comments on future research topics and issues to be addressed in relation to this review topic.

Reply 5

As suggested by the reviewer comments on future research were added to the conclusions (Summary)

Changes in text

See page 10 line 316-328

Reviewer B

I agree with the Reviewer's comments and I would send them to the Authors for minor revisions.

I would also ask Authors to:

- 1. update with lungART results presented at the recent ESMO 2021;

Reply 1

As suggested by the reviewer we updated with the recent results presented at

ESMO 2021

Changes in text

See page 6 line 166-111

- 2. include in the Abstract current indications for PORT, i.e. as per manuscript conclusions: selected incompletely resected NSCLC patients and those with extra nodal extension;

Reply 2

We have added the current indications in the abstract conclusions.

Changes in text

See page 2 line 52-55

- 3. mention in the paragraph about the Covid if current above indications are challenged or not during the Covid pandemic.

Reply 3

As suggested by the reviewer a mention of the challenge that covid pandemic required was done.

Changes in text

See page 10 line 312-315