

Peer review file

Article information: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jtd-20-2761>

Reviewer A

Comment 1:

It is well written and informative, but I think it lacks some fundamental parts.

Reply 1: We tried to give a wide overview of relevant parts of the disease. With our article we want to offer the reader the opportunity to quickly acquire a broad knowledge and in case of interested of special parts, to deepen detailed knowledge using the sources provided.

Comment 2:

There is no PICO question for each of the intervention proposed.

Reply 2: You find our PICCO Question for our article in the cover letter.

Comment 3:

It doesn't follow the PRISMA guidelines.

Reply 3: We answered the PRISMA Checklist, its attached on this E-Mail, but our article is a narrative review, not a systematic review.

Comment 4:

It doesn't mention the search criteria of the articles with the timeframe, the excluded ones and why, introducing though a significant bias.

Reply 4: Our article is a hand searched article.

Comment 5:

Overall it covers everything but I think it would be better suited for other publications of the same editorial group.

Reply 5: Thank you for reading our article and the feedback.

Reviewer B

Comment 1: I have some queries and suggestions that you should address first.

First, the paper should be written according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement (<http://www.prisma-statement.org/>).

Reply 1: We answered the PRISMA Checklist, its attached on this E-Mail.

Comment 2: Authors should declare if they perform a certified librarian search. Authors should add other databases in their search (e.g. CINAHL, EMBASE, Cochrane).

Reply 2: We focused on a search of the database on Pubmed.

Comment 3: The PICO questions should be declared before the systematic review. Please declare the string used.

Reply 3: You find our PICCO Question in the attached cover letter.

Comment 4: The heterogeneity of the studies included is absent, and a comment should be added in the discussion. The discussion should be improved with a better discussion about the limitations of narrative review.

Reply 4: We added the following sentence to the discussion.

Changes in the text: This article is a narrative review, due to the method, a certain subjectivity in the decision as to which studies are included is likely. In narrative reviews like this one, the large number of sources and studies cited accepts, that there is a complexity of interactions and that this Identification and integration could be difficult.

Comment 5: About minor points, there are typo errors in the text. Authors should thoroughly check the paper.

Reply 5: We structured our article in a new form und checked the paper ones more.

Comment 6: The references should be written according to the author's instructions.

Reply 6: The source was given according to the Vancouver criteria, as required by the JTD.

Reviewer C

Comment 1: Good review article, well written. Maybe some tables could allow a faster lecture of the most important results and allow you to give more precisions.

Reply 1: Thank you for the suggestion, but in this article, we focused on a running text.

Comment 2: Very interesting article dealing with all aspects of MPM. Challenging topics because, even if it's a rare cancer, it's a topic of interest.

Reply 2: Thank you for reading our article and the feedback.

Comment 3: Some references need to be updated and a section reporting results of immunotherapy should be inserted.

Reply 3: In the following article, we would like to report on the mentioned surgical and

conservative therapies.

Reviewer D

Comment 1: The authors have attempted to provide a literature review on a rather challenging and often controversial subject. They must be congratulated for the number of papers they included in their research and the time they invested in preparing this manuscript.

Reply 1: Thank you for reading our article and the feedback.

Comment 2: The authors set out to seek answers to the 3 following questions: Which conservative and operative therapy options are available? What is the study situation of the individual options? Are there established and experimental diagnostic approaches?

Reply 2: Thank you, with the questions mentioned you give exactly the questions we want to answer with our Article.

Comment 3: Even though a significant number of published articles has been utilised to provide answers to these questions, it is evident that the authors are not familiar with the subject to the degree of being able to filter through information and provide best supporting evidence. Presented data should have been more carefully assessed and critically reviewed, especially data which originated from studies involving a small number patients. Results from studies are presented without considering potential biases and limitations.

Reply 3: As you mentioned at the beginning of your comment the malignant pleural mesothelioma is a rare and challenging topic, also because of rare cases, because of this its impossible to give a wide overview without using studies which only involve a small number of patients.

Comment 4: The authors fail to provide a concise structure from diagnosis to treatment. It remains unclear to the reader of this article what is the state of current practice.

Reply 4: We have presented the current state of science in our paper. Unfortunately, there is not the perfect therapy that helps everyone. The therapy of the MPM is an individual therapy which has to be adapted to the patient, and if possible, should be carried out in the context of large studies.

Comment 5: The authors conclude that "Desirable would also be if further large-scale studies on the treatment options of the MPM were carried out". This would have been of course ideal however due to the many complexities involving the disease, its high mortality, challenges on establishing staging and standardised management and the ever evolving landscape of treatment modalities, these studies are almost impossible to plan and may fail to recruit necessary numbers of patients. For that reason, results from smaller studies become important and it's essential for review articles such as this not only to present information but to select the best information to present."

Reply 5: In our conclusion, we tried to draw the ideal picture, it would be perfect if all patients

could be included in large scale studies. But as we wrote: “Furthermore, patients with MPM should, if possible, be treated as part of study protocols at high-volume centers in order to collect further data for the future.”

Changes in the text: ... data for the future. If that's not possible data of the patients should be collected and presented in the context of smaller studies or case reports.
