

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/vats-23-27>

This paper reported the recent literature about a hot topic such as geriatric evaluation before thoracic surgery and it reported effectively the scores and used to stratify the older population. The argument is actual and interesting, but some flaws in the paper need clarification by the authors.

Comment 1: All the acronyms must be clearly defined before their appearance (ACS, NSQUIP...)

Reply 1: All acronyms defined at first appearance in the article

Comment 2: The type of article should be declared in the paper (this is a narrative review?) and modified accordingly

Reply 1: Declaration of article as narrative incorporated into the paper.

Comment 3: I suggest inserting a paragraph of Methods.

Reply 2: A Methods paragraph provided in the article.

Comment 4: All the tables should be revised and I suggest including the scores so that the reader can use it.

Reply 4: Permission for use of tables were cost prohibitive so they are to be eliminated.

5) I suggest inserting a paragraph into the discussion or results about the different impacts of different treatment approaches because it is well known that SABR or VATS wedge has a completely different impact than VATS segmentectomy or lobectomy. In this light, I suggest reading and reviewing these papers: Kirk F, et al. Thoracic Surgery and the Elderly; Is Lobectomy Safe in Octogenarians? Heart Lung Circ. 2023 Mar 30;S1443-9506(23)00140-3. doi: 10.1016/j.hlc.2023.03.005. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 37003939; Bongiolatti S, et al. Post-operative outcomes and quality of life assessment after thoracoscopic lobectomy for Non-small-cell lung cancer in octogenarians: Analysis from a national database. Surg Oncol. 2021 Jun;37:101530. doi: 10.1016/j.suronc.2021.101530. Epub 2021 Feb 1. PMID: 33548589.; Razi SS, et al. Lobectomy Versus Stereotactic Body Radiotherapy in Healthy Octogenarians With Stage I Lung Cancer. Ann Thorac Surg. 2021 May;111(5):1659-1665. doi: 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2020.06.097. Epub 2020 Sep 3. PMID: 32891656.

Reply 5: Articles suggested were reviewed and differences in approaches discussed in second paragraph of the Introduction.