

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jtd-22-619>

Reviewer A

Comment 1: This is a Delphi consensus (expert opinion) of Italian Surgeons opinions about, air leaks and operative hemorrhage. The conclusions are fine, buy may not be extrapolated to other settings.

Reply 1: We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. We agree with the reviewer that the opinion of one country alone can never represent the international consensus. Our objective was not to represent an international consensus, but to address some important clinical practical issues, some of which were of international interest. Moreover, among the panelists, there are many international KOLs.

Changes in the text: Not necessary

Comment 2: The text needs to be proofed to improve its language.

Reply 2: We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. We revised the text accordingly and several improvements have been introduced.

Changes in the text: Many changes in the text

Comment 3: Line 115 medical and non-medical costs. It is more appropriate for a technical paper to use **the terms direct and indirect health costs** (plus, if the authors want to refer to them as well, intangible costs)

Reply 3: We revised the text accordingly

Changes in the text: Line 247

Comment 4: Line 141 At European Level a modified Delphi survey showed...s. The Delphi method is a structured way of making decisions or reaching agreements by group of experts. As so its conclusions are Expert opinions and therefore are low grade evidence. In this context the verb to "show" conveys and strength that expert opinions do not have. Please **rephrase the sentence to let clear to the readers that in the opinion of the experts the use of sealants is an efficient treatment**

Reply 4: We revised the text accordingly

Changes in the text: Line 278

Comment 5: Line 153. The Delphi is a well-established iterative method of investigation, particularly used in scientific 154 research, which takes place through several phases of expression and evaluation of the opinions of a 155 group of experts and which aims to bring together the most complete and shared opinion in a single 156 "consent". 157 The standard Delphi is a social research methodology that has been used for over 30 years in the 158 clinical health field to investigate aspects for which there is no clear, unambiguous and ultimate 159 indications derived from scientific evidence or in situations where different alternative orientations 160 are

possible (19–22). **The Delphi method is a well-established procedure. The authors do not need to dwell in explaining the method. Just say they employed the Delphi method**

Reply 5: We revised the text accordingly

Changes in the text: Lines 296-299

Comment 6: Line 174 “was identified”. It seems to this reader that “**was produced**” fits better into the sentence

Reply 6: We revised the text accordingly

Changes in the text: Line 313

Reviewer B

Comment 7: Dear authors I had the opportunity to review your paper following a delphi consensus on prolonged Air leak and intraoperative bleeding in thoracic surgery. Although the methodology was correct your results do not add a clearly specified message at the end of the analysis. Maybe because the goal was not clearly defined. You could elaborate in the discussion **what in your opinion should the Italian society of thoracic surgery specifically address in the better knowledge of "newer" possibilities give from sealant and hemostats.**

Reply 7: We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. The authors are members of the Italian society of thoracic surgery and their objective is to increase the awareness and scientific knowledge through educational activities and scientific publications as this one.

Changes in the text: Lines 452-454

Reviewer C

Comment 8: Thank you for the great work. Such studies are fundamental in order to guide further research. **Apart from minor spelling/linguistic amendments (several throughout the manuscript) and minor inconsistencies (different font used for the images and the main text) I do not have any further comments.**

Reply 8: We thank the reviewer very much. We revised the text accordingly for the spelling/linguistic amendments and minor inconsistencies.

Changes in the text: Many changes in the text

Reviewer D

Comment 9: In that article, the authors raised an important clinically problem of persistent air leak and the management of intraoperative blood loss. Noteworthy, there are still no recognized and clear guidelines on these issues.

Authors associated with the Italian Society of Thoracic Surgery have developed an **expert position paper that may serve as valuable diagnostic and therapeutic guidance in clinical practice.**

Reply 8: We thank the reviewer very much.

Changes in the text: Not necessary

Reviewer E

Thank you for submitting this paper to Journal of Thoracic Disease, I was pleased to receive it as a reviewer and read with great interests.

The present Delphi analysis showed that air leak and intraoperative bleeding are clinical problems well known among thoracic surgeons. It also suggested the need of wider and updated scientific information about technical and registration characteristics of the topical hemostats and surgical sealants to provide healthcare and administrative staff with the opportunity to work and interact through a common and shared language and eventually to guarantee minimal requirements of assistance. This paper is well written and beneficial for our readers, however, I have several concerns about this article.

Major points

Comment 10: Why did you decide to conduct such a study in the first place? I think it is already clear that intraoperative air-leaks and bleeding are important problems in thoracic surgery. **What is new in this paper for the reader?** The usefulness of hemostatic agents is already well known. **Please indicate more clearly the background problem** because most of all items reached a positive consensus with high levels of agreement, which meant most thoracic surgeons confidently use them with no hesitation.

Reply 10: We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. The authors decided to conduct a Delphi survey because according to their clinical experience, there was an elevated level of awareness about intraoperative air-leaks and bleeding, but they had several concerns about the appropriateness of use of hemostatic agents and sealants. Moreover, often HCPs and administrative staff used a confused and unshared terminology.

Changes in the text: Lines 285-287

Comment 11: 2. Out of 46 Italian surgeons, 33 (72%) panel members responded to the Delphi questionnaire, **Should the survey collection rate be satisfactory compared to other consensus statements?**

Reply 11: The rate has been considered satisfactory. Furthermore, the participants are representative of the Italian geographical and working environments.

Changes in the text: Not necessary

Comment 12: 3. Please describe the specific action for wider and updated scientific information about technical and registration characteristics of the topical hemostats and surgical sealants to provide healthcare and administrative staff with the opportunity to work and interact through a common and shared language and eventually to guarantee minimal requirements of assistance

Reply 12: We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. The authors are members of the Italian society of thoracic surgery; the dissemination of updated scientific information will be performed through educational activities (as described in conclusions) and dissemination of scientific publications as this one.

Changes in the text: Lines 452-454

Comment 13: 4. I think the discussion section is stating the same thing over and over again, please organize it more concisely.

Reply 13: We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. We revised the text accordingly.

Changes in the text: Lines 379-383; 446; 450

Minor points

Comment 14: 1. There are too many expressions " in order of importance ", please organize them accordingly.

Reply 14: We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. We revised the text accordingly.

Changes in the text: Lines 383, 396, 417, 442, 448

Comment 15: 2. p13. Line 259. large areas of spleurized → should be typo

Reply 14: We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. We revised the text accordingly.

Changes in the text: Line 415