

## Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/aoe-22-15>

### **Reviewer A**

Comment: 1 Check English grammar

Reply: We thank the reviewer for the comment, and we had a native speaker edit the draft for grammar issues

Comment: Provide more references in the introduction. A lot of statements are being made without any reference. Please find the examples below. Examples no references:

- line 93 Recent reports have shown that circulating lymphocyte count

94 depletion after radiation has been associated with poor overall survival outcomes:

- line 100 The circulating lymphocyte pool are the cells that eventually become tissue resident lymphocytes and hence preserving the circulating lymphocyte pool or strategies to increase the T cell number are potential tools to improve tumor control outcomes in Esophageal cancer by increasing immunogenic cell death.

Reply: We thank the reviewer for the comment, and we cross checked the references and addressed any inadvertent errors that might have occurred. We also have added additional references to the sections that the authors have pointed out.

Comment: Write study or state that the study is performed in accordance with PRISMA.

Reply: We thank the reviewer for the comment, and we have written as such in the methods section.

Comment: Update search

Reply: We thank the reviewer for the comment. The process of doing a systematic review takes anywhere between 1-3 months and journals in view of COVID-19 are taking an incredibly long time to find reviewers and get the comments back to the authors. Though the search was last done in 9/2020, the process of completing the manuscript took 2-3 months and this was submitted to one journal before processing by Annals of Esophagus. Annals of Esophagus took 2 months to review and get back to us. It is unfair and not within the scope of this manuscript to redo the search process and essentially redo the analysis. The journal wants us to address the comments within 3 weeks. Unfortunately, we don't have the manpower to redo the search and rerun the statistics in a time efficient manner.

Comment: Start discussion with your main conclusion and not with some form of new introduction.

Reply: We thank the reviewer for the comment and have changed the discussion as advised.

### **Reviewer B**

Comment: The biggest concern is that although this is a review article, the references are not correctly marked. References 10, 13, and 16 do not match the text and references. Reference 26 is not listed in the text. Please check all references again and correct as necessary.

Reply: We thank the reviewer for the comment, and we cross checked the references and addressed any inadvertent errors that might have occurred.

Comment: The 5-year survival rate for esophageal cancer seems to be rather poor (Line 91). Please consider adding information such as “locally advanced esophageal cancer” instead of just referring to esophageal cancer.

Reply: We thank the reviewer for the comment, and have added as locally advanced esophageal cancer

Comment: Inadequate words are inserted in Line 100 and 195.

Reply: We thank the reviewer for the comment and have addressed this issue.

Comment: There is no discussion of the tumor location in the Discussion section. Please consider adding it since the tumor location was mentioned in the Introduction and Results sections

Reply: We thank the reviewer for the comment and have added the importance of location of the tumor and its implications in the discussion section