

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jtd-21-1856>.

Reviewer A:

I find the commentary on Turkish history fascinating. But this seems to be a long list (many paragraphs) of medical and surgical educators in Turkey.

Major:

1) I think broadly, there is some disconnect with fluid use of the English language in this manuscript. I addressed some of the issues in the minor comments, but more exist.

Minor:

- 1) Line 19: "As the population ages and tobacco consumption increases..."
- 2) Line 29: The sentence "like many countries..." is unclear. Are the authors trying to say the younger demographic is shrinking as the population ages?
- 3) Line 31: "According to the National Database..."
- 4) Line 32: "most common malignancy in men"
- 5) Line 33: "fourth most common malignancy in women"
- 6) Line 33: this comment on a high distal metastasis ration is unclear. Are the authors trying to say that the incidence of advanced malignancies upon presentation is high?
- 7) Line 47: I am not familiar with "teoric education"
- 8) Line 47: "The first medical college"
- 9) Lines 55-58: The sentence about Nissen does not flow well.
- 10) Line 66: "apart from the cardiovascular"
- 11) Line 71: do the authors mean three medical centers? Three units is unclear.
- 12) Line 75: "robotic resections date back"

Reply: The manuscript was checked for language and sentences were corrected. The issues you were addressed and others were taken care of.

Reviewer B:

It has been interesting to learn about the current situation of the thoracic surgery in Turkey.

However, part of the text does not provide such a relevant information as to keep the manuscript as it is now.

Paragraphs about the history of the thoracic surgery are very interesting because they are totally unknown. However much of what is comment about the current situation can be extrapolated to almost any western country (and to many of the eastern countries).

I have added in the file section (below) the manuscript with some comments for improvement. Those are minor comments

Reply: Thank you for your kind comments. The context was revised and more information about the current status in Turkey was mentioned. Necessary modifications have also been made according to additional comments.

Reviewer C:

The authors give a historical overview of thoracic surgery in Turkey, highlighting the rapid development of the specialty in Turkey. They describe recent trends and the growing elderly and smoking population. I thank the authors for their manuscript and have some comments to improve their manuscript:

Major Comments:

1. In the first paragraph, can the authors discuss trends in smoking rates? In the abstract, it is stated that tobacco consumption is increasing, but this is not supported by numbers in the manuscript.
2. Can the authors elaborate on what thoracic surgery training entails? Is it a set 5 years even when the “certain list of procedures” is not met? Is training standardized across the country? Is there a board exam for licensing at the end of residency? How many residents are there across the country and is this enough to meet the thoracic needs?
3. Can the authors comment on unmet needs in the country? Is access to thoracic surgery uniform across the country or do geographical and socioeconomic disparities present across different parts of the country? What are barriers to access to thoracic care, if any, in Turkey?

Minor Comments:

1. Line 27: please clarify what “both streams” means here (both continents?).
2. Line 28: “[The] socio-economic profile...” (“the” missing)
3. Line 28: “Eastern” and “Western” should be capitalized. This should be similarly modified throughout the text.
4. Line 47: “teoric education” is unclear. Should this be “theoretical” or “theological”?
5. Line 117: “Publons” instead of “Publon”
6. Line 154: “its” instead of “it’s”
7. Reference 1 is not properly cited. URLs should be cited according to the citation style used.

Reply: More information about training programs were included in the manuscript. Current status was also highlighted. Minor comments have been taken into account as well and the points were rectified.