

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/aoe-21-56>

Reviewer A

Though this is a narrative review, “studies comparing RAMIE and MIE” needs to include more studies. Many recent studies reporting benefit of RAMIE seem excluded. Introduction requires elaboration. Description of MIE is redundant.

We have modified the Introduction, the reasoning behind the information about MIE outcomes is because that is the approach that RAMIE is to be compared to.

We added a few other studies comparing RAMIE and MIE, we have extensively researched databases and verified with published literature reviews and meta-analyses, and we included the most relevant ones, particularly with the larger number of patients, we also added some recently published studies.

Reviewer B

The article presents a positive perspective on RAMIE, with little critical appraisal of issues to do with learning curve, training, and often high anastomotic leak rates. Some consideration of this would enhance a good narrative review.

We added a few comments on anastomosis and complications, unfortunately and we mentioned it, the published data does not show differences in incidence of anastomotic leaks between RAMIE and MIE. We looked in detail reported complications besides anastomotic leak, such as conduit ischemia, conversion to open, airway injury/fistula and these complications were very rarely reported. Is it due to improved technology from the robot or a publication bias?

Reviewer C

This is an excellent and comprehensive review. Well done. No change needed.
