

## Peer Review File

**Article Information:** <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jgo-24-66>

### Reviewer A

**Comment 1:** The manuscript entitled "Risk of de novo esophageal cancer in liver transplant recipients: systematic review and meta-analysis" is a well-done analysis presenting the data a various multicentric national studies. The authors included 12 papers with 28,530 patients.

They concluded that an endoscopic follow-up should be performed in liver transplant recipients.  
minor comment: in the Outcomes of interest section used first time the full acronym: SIR: Standardized incidence rates

**Reply 1:** Your observation is indeed valid, and we appreciate your suggestion to use the full term "Standardized incidence rates" to ensure that our readers have a clear understanding of the metric employed in our study. We have therefore revised the manuscript to incorporate this change. Now, when introducing SIR in the "Outcomes of interest" section, we will use the full term "Standardized incidence rates" (see Page 13, line 261). Subsequently, we will maintain the use of the abbreviated form "SIR" to ensure consistency and brevity throughout the manuscript.

**Changes in the text:** standardized incidence rates (SIR)

### Reviewer B

**Comment 2:** I congratulate the authors of this work, which fills an important gap. I believe that the article is well written and can be published in the current version, always considering the opinion of the editors.

**Reply 2:** I am deeply grateful for your recognition and encouragement regarding our work, which indeed aims to fill an important gap in the field. It is truly an honor to receive your positive feedback and acknowledgment.

With regards to your suggestion that the article can be published in its current version, while also considering the opinion of the editors, we fully concur. We will carefully consider any additional suggestions or recommendations from the editorial team and make necessary revisions to further enhance the quality and academic value of our manuscript.

Once again, thank you for your valuable comments and support. We are hopeful that our work will be published soon and contribute towards advancing research and practice in the relevant field

**Changes in the text:** None

**Comment 3:** L14: Sensitivity analysis involved excluding studies one by one (this is an unclear presentation. Please rewrite)

**Reply 3:** Your comment is well-received. I have rewritten the sentence to make it clearer and more concise (see Page 3, line 56 ).

**Changes in the Text:** Sensitivity analysis was undertaken by systematically excluding

individual studies involved excluding studies one by one, while potential publication bias was assessed using funnel plots and Egger's test. Additionally, subgroup analyses were also performed to explore sources of heterogeneity aiming to enhance the robustness and reliability of our findings.

**Comment 4:** L25: A significantly increased risk of esophageal cancer following liver transplantation compared to the general population (A complete sentence should be used here. Please rewrite)

**Reply 4:** I appreciate your suggestion. I have rewritten the sentence to ensure it is a complete and grammatically correct statement (see Page 4, line 73).

**Changes in the Text:** The risk of esophageal cancer is significantly increased following liver transplantation compared to the general population