

## Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jgo-22-13>

### Reviewer A

**Comment 1:** Very important and currently active topic. I have the following comments and suggestions:

In the introduction it is stated that organ saving approach is not standard. This is part of NCCN guidelines now and many north American centers apply this approach in a standard way!

**Reply 1:** We completely agree with the reviewer statement but we acknowledge that, at least globally, it is not yet widely practiced. We tried to make the impressions on the readers that this a valid and a sensible option to contemplate in certain situations yet we still do not have level I evidence to support full endorsement of this strategy. We restated the sentence in the introduction accordingly (please see line 86).

**Comment 2:** Extensive review of the literature is submitted in this analysis however a piece that is missing is the role of these different treatment modalities on lateral pelvic lymph nodes status. If this would be also added the manuscript would improve and be more complete.

**Reply 2:** A very interesting point indeed. We could not find robust data to support specific way of action in response to lateral pelvic nodes (LPN). Of note, we addressed this issue when we discussed the eligibility criteria for RAPIDO trial (total neoadjuvant section) as patients with LPN were also eligible to participate in the trial as this reflects a relatively high risk of occult metastasis.

### Reviewer B

**Comment 1:** The author summarized well for previous clinical trials, which are related

with treatment of LARC. I think that subtitles and categorization for rectal cancer treatment in this manuscript were adequate to understand development of rectal cancer treatment strategies. In addition, the explanations for TNT are important issues for current treatment of LARC. So I think that this manuscript is valuable to understand rectal cancer treatments. However, there are too many errors of English grammar in the manuscript. I recommend to submit again after professional English editing. Other minor points below are required to be corrected

**Reply 1:** Thank you very much for this valuable comment. We have extensively reviewed the manuscript and made several corrections and shortened some sentences.

Minor corrections:

**Comment 2:** In the introduction, most sentences are redundant. Please make concise the introduction why you want to explain for rectal cancer treatments. (Especially, the sentences of line 68-70 and line 85-87).

**Reply 2:** We restated and deleted few sentences in the introduction section accordingly. We added a sentence to describe our objective behind this review, Namely, to make treatment selection easier and more consistent based on current evidence.

**Comment 3:** When you begin to explain the clinical trial, please add the reference at the sentence. For example, sentence line 117-118 needs to add the related reference.

**Reply 3:** We have addressed this issue in the modified manuscript so that all the references are presented at the beginning of the sentences.

**Comment 4:** In Table 1 and 2, please add the related references, which can be related with the trials.

**Reply 4:** We added the relevant references.