

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/vats-23-43>

Reviewer A

As pointed out by the authors, several studies have been performed to evaluate the safety and efficacy of VATS lobectomy in the general population, however, there are few that examine the patient population over 70 years of age.

Comment 1: The manuscript lacks of a fundamental key point, the object of the Editorial Commentary. This article is the comment to what? The authors should specify this point.

Response 1: Thank you for this comment. The intention was to provide a review article on the topic of Video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery in older adults – I believe editorial commentary is suggested as we provided the journal with a book chapter for a special series that is currently still in process, and this article is an extension of that. Perhaps a mini-review would be a better fit than editorial commentary.

Comment 2: Typos in the manuscript.

Response 2: Thank you for your comment. Please see the revised manuscript.

Reviewer B

Comment 1: The entire manuscript seems hastily written and needs to be read and revised, starting from the title which is not grammatically correct.

Response 1: Thank you for your comment, please see the revision made to this manuscript.

Comment 2: The first half of the first paragraph describing lobectomy is unnecessary given the intended audience of the commentary.

Response 2: Thank you for this valid comment, we shortened that paragraph.

Comment 3: There is no link between the statements “octagenarians represent a rapidly growing population” and “average life expectancy for 80-year old patient is 7-9 years” (lines 18-19).

Response 3: Thank you, we corrected the statement.

Comment 4: The line “more studies have yet to be done.. lines 16-17) does not make any sense.

Response 4: Thank you for your comment we corrected this in the body.

Comment 5: The line “many physicians are reluctant to refer octagenarians” lacks basis and requires a reference or, preferably, rewording (lines 21-22). This is also a run-on sentence.

Response 5: Please see the corrected manuscript.

Comment 6: “Despite scarce literature on this topic” should not preface a few studies have attempted..”. Incorrect use of “despite” (lines 23-24).

Response 6: Thank you we appreciate you pointing this out, please see the corrected wording.

Comment 7: The bullet point style in lines 46-51 is inappropriate considering the format of the commentary.

Response 7: Thank you we corrected the formatting.

Comment 8: The way that the references are cited in the paper needs to be corrected.

Response 8: Thank you, please see corrected reference format.

Comment 9: I do think that some of the points about technical considerations for lobectomy and postoperative management in the elderly are interesting – I would like to see a bit more in the way of citations or references in this section.

Response 9: Please see the addition to the manuscript.

Comment 10: Overall, I think the senior author on this paper needs to revise this manuscript heavily to make it a worthwhile addition to the journal. As it stands now, the manuscript is amateurish and provides no discernible benefit, message, or use to the reader. The way the studies are cited in this manuscript add little complexity to the discussion on VATS lobectomy in the elderly.

Response 10: Thank you, we appreciate your comments and suggestions. Please see the revisions made throughout the manuscript.