

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tbcr-24-2>

Reviewer Comments

Reviewer A

Comment 1: Methods, line 75: Please review the wording “in this space” – would “in this field” or “in this area” sound better?

Reply 1: Thank you for this suggestion.

Changes in the text: We have modified our text as advised to “field” as suggested on page 4 line 76.

Comment 2: Line 110: please give the citation of the nomogram

Reply 2: Thank you for this suggestion. This reference was placed at the end of the next two sentences which also refer to the same paper (ref 13).

Changes in the text: The reference was added to this line as well so that it is clear that this publication contains the nomogram.

Comment 3: Line 141: “randomized control trials”, please correct: “randomized controlled trials”

Reply 3: Thank you for this suggestion.

Changes in the text: We have modified our text as advised.

Comment 4: Line 13: please give citations for all of the 3 trials

Reply 4: Thank you for this suggestion. I have inferred that this is in reference to line 143 not line 13 and this has been corrected.

Changes in the text: Citations for all 3 trials have been added.

Comment 5: Section 3.4 IM Nodal Radiation

- Please provide more details on improving RT techniques

- Furthermore, it should be discussed that the randomized studies that have shown an advantage for IMNI radiation have yet to stratify (neo-)adjuvant therapy according to biological tumor types to the extent that is common today (luminal, non-luminal, basal cell, etc.). Due to the significantly improved (neo-)adjuvant therapy, the prognosis of patients has been improved considerably in some cases. So far, we do not know whether IMNI radiation still has any prognostic relevance in this context of individualized medicine.

Reply 5: Thank you for these thoughtful suggestions. We have reviewed the presented text and feel that exploring the evolution of PMRT techniques over the past two decades is beyond the scope of this review. We have included the suggested content regarding the incomplete data in the literature with respect to biologic subtypes of breast cancer.

Changes in the text: See added content on Page 9, Lines 212-214.

Reviewer B

Comment 1: Authors presented the non-randomized Danish study (ref 24) in page 7, line 175 published in 2016. There is an update in JCO 22 (same first author). Authors will need to use the 2022 and give a better description of the study (Patients with L breast cancer received radiation to the IMN and the R breast cancer did not receive IMN radiation. This is quite important for the readers.

Reply 1: Thank you for identifying this publication containing the updated data from the Thorsen et al group. We chose to include the historical reference on page 7 mentioned here since that is the publication that influenced the updated American Society of Clinical Oncology recommendations. The 2022 publication is referenced on Page 8 lines 182-186. And described as the 15-year follow-up of this patient cohort. Changes in the text: No changes were made in the text since the suggested content was already contained in the manuscript and references.

Comment 2: In order to make the readers further enjoy this review, I suggest that the authors add 2 figures: one of an MRI and an IMN nodes with the absence of fatty hilum and the second is probably a PET scan with an IMN+/- other LN's.

Reply 2: Thank you for the suggestion of added a visual to enhance the experience of the reader.

Changes in the text: Reference to figures has been added to page 5 line 119. Figures have been added to the review on page 16.