

## Peer Review File

**Article information:** <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/med-22-18>

### Review Comments

#### Reviewer A

Comment 1: The entire manuscript requires a heavy English language editing. There are a lot of the same word repetitions in the same paragraphs.

Reply 1: Thank you for the feedback. Extensive edits have been made to improve reading.

Changes in the text: 7-28 abstract has gone multiple edits, 39-55 has been edited and revised into History, 67-72 Methods section was edited and expanded, 78-91 Incidence has undergone grammar and structure edits, 95-103 Etiology has undergone minor edits, 107-128 presentation has undergone multiple structural and grammar edits, 132-163 has undergone grammar edits, word choice changes and structural changes, 167-200 management has undergone structural changes, grammar edits and word choice changes, 206-278 techniques for repair has also gone structural, grammatic and word changes. 282-287 conclusion has been reworded and undergone grammar edits.

Comment 2: Introduction: please clearly indicate what were reasons for this review. As of now, the introduction looks like a list of historical facts that are not connected and there is no a logical flow.

Reply 2: The introduction has been re-worded and re-arranged in effort to make this clearer. A section “History” was created to place historical facts separate from importance of review.

Changes in the text: Previous Introduction was reformatted from pages 2-3 lines 30-63 to the Introduction now page 3 lines 37-49, History section now page 5 lines 70-89

Comment 3: Methods are too short. Please include exact strategy for a literature search, inclusion and exclusion criteria for the manuscripts.

Reply 3: The methods section has been expanded and a table was added for more details

Changes in the text: 67-72 Methods section was edited and expanded now pages 3-4 lines 51-65

Comment 4: The Results are reported under Discussion title. Again, the results is a just a simple description of included papers. Please add some analysis, some statistics from the included papers.

Reply 4: In accordance with the guidelines for Mediastinum for a narrative review, the discussion was re-labeled as Main body

Changes in the text: page 4, line 74 → page 5, line 68

Comment 5: here are no statements about limitations of this review.

Reply 5: Limitations section was added in discussion section.

Changes in the text: lines added now page 11, lines 311-318

Reviewer B

Comment 1: There are significant numbers of grammatical and other sentence structural errors that make the reading of this unacceptable. Please carefully read the manuscript and have it proofread by others. Also the language at times is very hard to understand to the point that it impacts content significantly. For instance the sentence starting on line 198 asserts that the best prognosis are those who present "pulseless with signs of life". However that is not true -the best results are seen in those who present WITH a pulse. I will be happy to review the manuscript again once it has been revised

Reply 1: Significant work was done on the grammar and structure of sentences throughout the manuscript. Specific changes were also made to clarify line 198 that authors strongly recommend EDT on patients who present pulseless with signs of life.

Changes to text: 7-28 abstract has gone multiple edits, 39-55 has been edited and revised into History, 67-72 Methods section was edited and expanded, 78-91 Incidence has undergone grammar and structure edits, 95-103 Etiology has undergone minor edits, 107-128 presentation has undergone multiple structural and grammar edits, 132-163 has undergone grammar edits, word choice changes and structural changes, 167-200 management has undergone structural changes, grammar edits and word choice changes, 206-278 techniques for repair has also gone

structural, grammatic and word changes. 282-287 conclusion has been reworted and undergone grammar edits.