

## Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tcr-24-1313>

### Reviewer A

The study is certainly innovative and the proposed protocol is certainly interesting. However, I would like to make some suggestions:

- 1- line 87: Please enter the approval number of Institutional Ethics Committee;  
*Reply 1: Institutional Ethics Committee approval number has been included.*  
*Changes in the text: see line 78-79, page 5*

---
- 2- line 106: Please specify that it is a opportunistic sample and no calculation of the samples size has been performed;  
*Reply 2: An explanation has been added into the manuscript.*  
*Changes in the text: see line 96, page 6*

---
- 3- line 182-182: Please specify why 3 of the 13 eligible patients did not participate in the trial;  
*Reply 3: As stated in the manuscript, participation in the study was completely voluntary. Although there were 13 eligible patients, 3 patients did not consent to take part in the study. This has been clarified in the manuscript.*  
*Changes in the text: see line 162-163, page 9*

---
- 4- line 183: Please add in which table the data are presented;  
*Reply 4: This has been clarified in the manuscript.*  
*Changes in the text: see line 164, page 9*

---
- 5- line 189-190: Please cancel the sentence: "See Table 2 for a summary of patients characteristics".  
*Reply 5: This change has been implemented.*  
*Changes in the text: see line 169-170, page 9*

---
- 6- line 194-195: Please specify why 79 sessions were not performed;  
*Reply 6: We have now described full details related to missed sessions.*  
*Changes in the text: see line 175-178, page 9*

---
- 7- - line 199: Please specify the reasons for abandoning treatment. How many conflicting appointments, how many hypersalivation, etc;  
*Reply 7: Since the sentence was unclear, we have revised this sentence. The patient abandoned treatment completely due to hypersalivation. This has now been clarified in the manuscript.*

*Changes in the text: see line 181, page 10*

---

8- - line 212-214: Please move the sentence in "Discussion";

*Reply 8: This comment has been implemented.*

*Changes in the text: see line 191-193, page 10 and line 289-291, page 15.*

---

9- - Discussion in general: As it is a feasibility study, it would be interesting to consider the treatment also from an economic point of view.

*Reply 9: We fully agree with the reviewer and have added information regarding the economic burden of oral mucositis in head and neck cancer into the Discussion section.*

*Changes in the text: see line 223-236, page 12*

---

10- It would also be interesting to compare the data obtained from the trial with a control group.

*Reply 10: Thank you for the reviewer's suggestion; we agree that this would add value to the manuscript. However, as this was a feasibility study to determine patients' acceptance of the cooling treatment, only qualitative data were presented, and no statistical analyses were performed on the collected data. Consequently, the study design does not allow for comparisons with a control group. That being said, we have clarified this rationale further in the conclusion section of the manuscript.*

*Changes in the text: see line 300-303, page 15*

---

11- I also advise to pay attention on the patient's oral condition, including oral hygiene, because a bad condition could increase the risk of developing RIOM or make less tolerable the treatment experienced (see Lee, C.T.; Galloway, T.J. Pathogenesis and Amelioration of Radiation-Induced Oral Mucositis. *Curr. Treat. Options Oncol.* 2022, 23, 311–324 and Lanzetti J, Finotti F, Savarino M, Gassino G, Dell'Acqua A, Erovigni FM. Management of Oral Hygiene in Head-Neck Cancer Patients Undergoing Oncological Surgery and Radiotherapy: A Systematic Review. *Dent J (Basel).* 2023 Mar 16;11(3):83. doi: 10.3390/dj11030083.)

*Reply 11: We thank the reviewer for their helpful suggestion. We have revised the manuscript to include additional information regarding education provided to patients on maintaining standard oral hygiene.*

*Changes in the text: see line 98-100, page 6*

---

## **Reviewer B**

### **1. Ethical Statement**

a) Please provide the full name of the ethics committee.

into the study. The study was approved by the **local Institutional Ethics Committee** (approval number: 2021-00887) and conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki (as revised in 2013). The

Reply: We have now added the name of the ethics committee.

## 2. Tables

a) Please provide the header of the table.

XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>Tumor Localisation</b>	Oral Cavity	2
	Oropharynx	4
	Hypopharynx	1
	Larynx	1
	Thyroid	1
	Parotid	1
<b>Age</b>	Mean	62 [47-76]
<b>Sex</b>	F	2
	M	8

Reply: We have now added the header to the table and made minor formatting changes to make table clearer for readers.

b) Please add the description to the table footnote that how the data are presented in table.

Oral Cavity	2
Oropharynx	4
Hypopharynx	1
Larynx	1
Thyroid	1
Parotid	1
Mean	62 [47-76]
F	2
M	8
Mean	90 [70-90]
Chemoradiation	4
Radiotherapy	6

Reply: All units have now been added to the table. The table description has also been updated.

c) Please provide the unit for Age in the table.

Reply: This has now been added.