Peer Review File

Article information: https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/aes-21-43

Reviewer A:

Comments:

1. First, in the title, there are "review" and "Narrative Review", which are different, strictly speaking. I suggest the authors to make this clear.

Reply : Changed « review » to « Assessment ».

Changes in the text : Changed « review » to « Assessment » (page 1, line 2)

2. Second, please ensure the abstract was written according to the reporting guideline of Narrative Reviews.

1) In the background, it remains unclear why this review topic is necessary.

Reply : We added text documenting the importance of this review for developing and honing surgical curricula for vitreoretinal surgical training programs.

Changes in the text: We added text (page 2, lines 48-51).

2) The objective should be specific and should not be ultimate goal.

Reply : As a review article of various educational modalities, the objective of the paper is to educate and broaden understanding of what is currently accessible for vitreoretinal surgical trainees and to discuss ways in which these training tools help these trainees and complement one another.

Changes in the text: : We added text (page 2, lines 53-54)

3) The methods part is too simple. Please consider to describe the literature search and criteria for the inclusion of relevant studies.

Reply : added specifics for Pubmed search and the topic criteria that were explored

Changes in the text: We added text (page 2, lines 56-59)

4) The conclusion should not just indicate the benefits of vitreoretinal surgical training tools, I think how

to improve the quality of training is also important, which should be emphasized.

Reply: Broadened the conclusion to discuss the role of standardizing/enhancing surgical training curricula. Changes in the text: We added text (page 2, lines 62-75).

3. Third, in the introduction of the main text, please explain the clinical significance of this review topic and why there is a need for this review.

Reply : Added explanation for importance of the review.

Changes in the text: We added text (page 3, lines 81-82, 90-93)

4. Fourth, the authors need to use a separate part to describe the literature search and crude criteria for studies to be reviewed here.

Reply : We added text at the end of the Introduction as adding a « methods « area would have been very short. The paper is meant to be a discussion of the various educational tools available

Changes in the text: We added text (page 3, lines 81-82, 90-93)

5. Fifth, in the part of literature review, in addition to descriptions of relevant studies, please also have comments on their methodology.

Reply : added in areas text highlighting the review studies

Changes in the text: We added text (page 3, lines 81-82, 90-93)

6. Finally, in the conclusion part, please have comments on problems to be addressed in relation to vitreoretinal surgical training and suggestions on how to address these problems.

<u>Reply: added text for the goal of creating surgical curricula integrating these training tools and to aim for</u> prospective studies to assess efficacy impact of these tools on actual patient care

Changes in the text: We added text (page 8, lines 217-220)

Reviewer A' Further Comments:

Many thanks to the authors for revising the manuscript based on the comments. However, there are still some minor issues that need to be addressed according to the Narrative Review Checklist. Please see the comments below.

Comment 1: Abstract

It is a great pleasure to see that the authors have been described the background, objective, methods and conclusion in the Abstract (line 41-62). However, there are still some issues that needs to be addressed.

(1) Please combine "Background" and "Objective" into a subsection entitled "Background and Objective" Reply: The text was updated

Changes in the text: Line50 and the paragraphs were combined for the respective sections.

(2) Regarding the methods of search in the Abstract (line 53-57), please specify the timeframe (e.g. "January 2000 to December 2021") and specify the language for these included article (i.e. "publications in English").

Reply: The text was updated.

Changes in the text: Added text Line 61-62.

(3) We suggest the authors add a subsection entitled "Key content and findings" to describe what this literature review will contain and key findings during the literature review.

Reply: Due to the review nature of the article, the key contents and findings subsection was created but with broad overview statement for the aim of the paper: to review and assess the surgical eye models, simulators, and rubrics.

Changes in the text: Text adjusted line 64-66.

Comment 2: Methods

Please add the "Methods" section (a separate part to describe the search process in detail) after the "Introduction" section, including a completed table as follows:

https://fomm.amegroups.com/pages/view/guidelines-for-authors#content-2-2-1

This part is essential as it reflects the sources of evidence (even though it is not a systematic review).

Reply: Table was created and text was added. Changes in the text: text added Line 96-104.

Comment 3: References

(1) The corresponding references must be cited when the words "several studies" or "many studies" appear in the text E.g, "several studies ..." (in line 77 and line 89), "... in numerous studies ..." (line 93), etc. Reply: text added.

Changes in text: line 92 text added citation.

(2) In addition, "Moreover, unexpected world events like the COVID-19 pandemic reduced in-person training and patient volumes, affecting surgical training to varying degrees for residents and fellows." (in line 71-73), it also needs to cite relevant reference.

Reply: text was deleted. Changes in text: text was deleted.

(3) The reference format to be adjusted following the AES: https://aes.amegroups.com/pages/view/guidelines-for-authors#content-3-8
Reply: text has been adjusted.
(4)Please note that the first author "Barth", not "Ghosh", should be cited when citing reference 9 (in line

120).Reply: text adjusted.Changes in text: line 141 updated.