

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/amj-23-178>

Reviewer A:

Comment 1: I read with interest the editorial commentary entitled “Role of Single-Use Bronchoscopes for Advanced Bronchoscopy Procedures”. In this article, the authors describe the advantages of using single-use flexible bronchoscopes over the use of reusable flexible bronchoscopes, including the reduced risk for cross-contamination, portability, ease of access, and better cost-effectiveness. The manuscript is generally well-written and easy to follow. The data that is presented will be informative to many clinicians. I have only a few comments to strengthen the manuscript.

Line 3: The title of the manuscript can be misleading. From the title of the manuscript, the anticipation may be to discuss the role of single-use flexible bronchoscopes in the setting of advanced bronchoscopic procedures. Although there is much focus on the advantages of SUFB over RFB including cost-effectiveness, reduced risk for cross contamination, and ease of access throughout the editorial, there is only one reference in the manuscript to the use of SUFB in advanced bronchoscopic procedures on lines 162-166. I would suggest that the authors either change the title of their editorial to reflect the content discussed, or expand and focus the discussion on the role of SUFB in advanced bronchoscopic procedures more thoroughly.

Reply 1: We have changed the title.

Comment 2: Line 3: For consistency, consider replacing “...Single-Use Bronchoscopes...” with “Single-Use Flexible Bronchoscopes”, especially since SUFB is used as an abbreviation later in the editorial commentary.

Reply 2: We have made this change.

Comment 3: Line 31: Instead of “This invention facilitated myriad diagnostic and...”, the authors may consider “This invention facilitated a myriad of diagnostic and...”

Reply 3: We have made this change.

Comment 4: Line 36: Instead of “...single-use bronchoscopes (SUFB)”, the authors may consider “single-use flexible bronchoscopes (SUFB)” given the abbreviation used.

Reply 4: We have made this change.

Comment 5: Line 51: Please change “...suite4” to “...suite”.

Reply 5: We have made this change.

Comment 6: Line 120: For consistency, the authors may consider changing the abbreviation “RUFB” to “RFB”. Please change this throughout the editorial commentary.

Reply 6: We have made this change.

If the constraints for the editorial commentary permits, the authors may consider addition of images into their manuscript to further highlight the image quality of SUFB.

Reviewer B:

Comment 1: I hope this message finds you well. I have had the opportunity to review your commentary titled "Role of Single-Use Bronchoscopes for Advanced Bronchoscopy Procedures." I appreciate your effort in contributing to the literature on this important topic. However, I would like to offer some constructive feedback to enhance the quality and relevance of your manuscript.

Originality and Relevance:

There are already several published commentaries available on this topic. The most recent one published Sep 28, 2023 entitled "Bronchoscopy Related Infection and the Development of Single Use Bronchoscopy Technology". To make your work more valuable, I recommend focusing on novel insights from your daily practice, alternative perspectives, or discussing more recent advancements in the field that could change the landscape of bronchoscopy procedures.

We have made an attempt to address this by expanding the environmental impact, infection control and cost analysis sections.

Comment 2: References and Citations:

The references cited in your commentary appear to be somewhat outdated. To strengthen the credibility of your work, it is essential to include references from recent studies, particularly those published within the last few years, which can provide readers with the most up-to-date information and insights. Please consider incorporating the latest research findings to support your arguments.

We have added and changed some of the references to make the paper more relevant.

Comment 3: Discussion of Newer Studies:

Given the rapidly evolving nature of medical technology and practices, it is imperative to incorporate findings from newer studies that have emerged since your original commentary. These studies can offer valuable data, insights, and perspectives that may reshape the discussion around the role of single-use bronchoscopes. Be sure to critically analyze and discuss these newer studies and their implications for advanced bronchoscopy procedures.

We have included the newest studies for each section and we tried to have a more critical analysis. We have also included our own institution's images for Ambu aScope 5.

Comment 4: Clarity and Organization:

It would be beneficial to improve the organization and clarity of your commentary. Ensure that your arguments and key points are presented logically, making it easier for

readers to follow your line of reasoning. Consider using more substantial subheadings to divide different sections and provide a clear structure to your commentary.

Conclusion:

In your conclusion, summarize the key takeaways from your revised commentary and emphasize how they contribute to the current understanding of single-use bronchoscopes and their role in advanced bronchoscopy procedures. Highlight any potential implications for clinical practice or future research directions.

In summary, I believe that with the incorporation of recent studies and a more focused approach, your commentary can provide valuable insights into the role of single-use bronchoscopes for advanced bronchoscopy procedures. I look forward to seeing how you address these suggestions and strengthen your manuscript.

Thank you for your dedication to advancing medical knowledge in this field, and I wish you success in your revisions.

Reviewer C:

Comment: In this manuscript the Authors provide a review of the literature comparing reusable (RFB) and single-use flexible bronchoscopes (SUFB) in advanced bronchoscopic procedures. The topic is of interest, and the manuscript provides a thorough analysis of the studies comparing the two types of instruments. However, the Authors focus only partially on the role of single-use bronchoscopes in advanced procedures. The results of the available prospective study comparing RFB and SUFB (see reference No.23) should therefore be analyzed in greater detail. Moreover, Tables reporting technical differences and cost-effectiveness of the two types of bronchoscopes could improve the manuscript.

Reply: We did change the title of the paper so as to not focus on just advanced bronchoscopic procedures.

Reviewer D:

This review is about single-use bronchoscopy. I think that the content is not too much or too little, and the necessary points are well written.

Major comment

Comment 1: Many single-use bronchoscopes are now available worldwide. I think it will be easier for readers to understand if authors combine these into one table, so please consider it.

Reply 1: Given the constraints of the commentary, we have limited the paper to 1 figure.

Minor comment

Comment 2: "4" in line 51 may be a typo. please confirm.

Reply 2: We have made this change.