

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/asj-21-98>

Reviewer A Comments:

This manuscript is summarized about the optimal assessment of neoadjuvant treatment for non-small cell lung cancer. However, one minor point should be revised to brush up the manuscript:

In line 57 and 58, the statement of “It has been shown that life expectancy is worse in surgical treatments performed after 6 weeks” is ambiguity. This sentence should be explained in detail.

Reply:

The purpose of the marked sentence (line 57-58) is explained in the title “Timing of restaging after neoadjuvant therapy (line 70-78)” and new literature has been added (marked in red).

Reviewer B Comments:

The authors have collected in one place the imaging procedures used in the assessment of the response to neoadjuvant treatment in non-small cell lung cancer. The paper is a comparison and summary of the applicable criteria used in the re-staging process. Although the paper shows data that are usually available and often compiled in medical journals, the form in which authors presented this topic is worth appreciating. It is concise, short, and accessible. For many readers, the compiled tables will be very useful.

1. Please check the English language spelling and do related editing, for example:

- 1) Line 1: “Procedures” instead of “prosedures”, “the assessment” and “response” instead of “response”.
- 2) Line 10: I suggest writing just the “The neoadjuvant therapy is still...”
- 3) Line 14: I suggest writing “as standards worldwide” instead of “standard all over the world”
- 4) Line 44: “mycormetastasis” to “micrometastasis”
- 5) Line 71-72: I suggest writing: “The updated version was released in ...”

2. I also propose some technical changes to improve the credibility of this paper slightly:

- 1) Line 27-28: It is not a good idea to present meaningful, oncological data based on a paper from 2009. I suggest using the most recent literature and presenting the most up-to-date statistics!

In my opinion, references to tables should be included in the text of the manuscript, for example, “Data A are presented in the Table X”.

- 2) Line 78-82: especially these lines, but basically, it is a note to the whole manuscript: if there is a statement from the literature, then after each sentence, there should be a quotation of the paper from

which the data comes!

Also, if the data in the tables do not represent your research results, the citation number from which the data in the table is derived should appear at the end of the table description - please include the citation - source for the data of Table 3!

3. The problem of the paper is the lack of citations, given in several places:

- lines 78-82
- lines 86-87
- line 88,
- line 91
- line 96
- line 99
- line 107
- Table 1 - where do the data in this table come from? I read quotation number 10 and did not find some of the percentage values presented in the table.

Please add relevant citations and data sources. Their absence makes it a bit difficult to verify the correctness of the data included in your paper!

Reply:

1. English language and spelling is edited (line 1-10-14-44-71-72).
2. More recent new literature added (line 27-28), reference table numbers added to manuscript.
3. Reference numbers added to manuscript (line 78-82, 86-87, ...107). Table 1- reference is corrected as number 9.