

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/joma-22-35>

Comment 1: First, the authors need to revise the title to be specific to the anaesthetic care of patients undergoing major oral cancer resection and immediate free flap surgical reconstruction, and the review type of this paper.

Reply 1: We welcome the reviewer's suggestion, and have updated the review title to: Anaesthetic considerations for major cancer resection and free flap reconstruction in oral cancer: a review.

This is not a narrative review or systematic review. It is correctly categorised as a conventional (traditional) review article, and follows the journal's author guidance for this type of review - including adhering to the specific template for this type of review and recommended word count range. This type of review has been approved by the journal editorial office and by the guest editor of the series.

We have now included reference to the limitations of a conventional review versus narrative and systematic reviews in the revised strengths and limitations section.

Comment 2: Second, the abstract is a little long. Please briefly clarify the clinical needs for this review, how the literature was retrieved, briefly summarize the cautions and procedures for the anaesthetic care and free flap reconstruction, and have an overall comment for the key procedures to improve the efficacy and safety.

Reply 2: We thank the reviewer for their advice, and we have reduced the number of words as they have suggested.

We are conscious that the abstract is a crucial part of the review and are keen to retain the level of detail and structure that we have currently provided. For these reasons, we would be reticent to further reduce the word count much beyond what we have done in the revised manuscript. The abstract word count is within the recommended limit for this type of review, in accordance with the journal's author guidance.

Comment 3: Third, in the main text, please briefly describe the potential clinical significance of this review, how the literature was retrieved, and I suggest the authors to use a figure or table to summarize key points in the anaesthetic care and free flap reconstruction.

Reply 3: This review is designed to address a gap in guidance on clinical management of this group of patient, as there is no specific agreed standard of care. The review aims to provide achievable, deliverable recommendations to anaesthetists providing care to this specific group of patients.

Because this is a conventional review article, inclusion of a specific search methodology, date of search, search engines utilised, number of studies etc. is not recommended - in accordance with the journal's author guidance for this particular type of review article. A table of the

search methodology/strategy and search results is more in keeping with a narrative or systematic review, which this article is not.

Comment 4: Fourth, in the summary part, please emphasize the key procedures and share the authors' clinical experiences to guarantee the quality of major oral cancer resection.

Reply 4: We thank the reviewer for their suggestion. The manuscript has undergone revision to include a summary of our key recommendations from review of the literature and from our own clinical experience.