

Peer Review Report

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Decent manuscript...worth publication. Minor Revision needed... Authors Must add in discussion...A study recently published from India (Sachdeva et al) in Portuguese Journal of Gastroenterology regarding Primary Esophageal Lymphoma with bone / sacral metastasis should be included in Discussion and References....Rest is okay

Response: I have added the above requested study to paragraph 6 of the discussion and referenced it appropriately.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This manuscript, despite the small number of included patients, shows very interesting data and with potential therapeutic impact on patients with oesophageal carcinoma and oligometastatic disease. The structure of the manuscript is respected, data are shown in detail, also illustrated in Tables (two) and Figure (one). Discussion paragraph is also nicely conceived. References are up-to date and respect the format. Some minor suggestions are listed below: INTRODUCTION: Please mention the full words before abbreviations, no matter if abbreviated in the Abstract or not. The full manuscript has to be understood (nCRT, SCC, AC etc). MATERIALS AND METHODS: Please insert : "Patient Database" on a different row. DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION: Please insert also some practical perspectives for future research/therapy. STROBE checklist should have the number of page inserted. Please correct ORCHID to ORCID. Please insert ORCID for all authors. There are no « Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form » and « Copyright License Agreement ». Please add.

INTRODUCTION

Line 6 of 1st paragraph of 'introduction' - nCRT changed to neo-adjuvant chemoradiotherapy, followed by abbreviation (nCRT)

Line 5 of 2nd paragraph of 'introduction' - SCC changed to squamous cell carcinoma, followed by abbreviation (SCC)

Line 6 of 2nd paragraph of 'introduction' - AC changed to adenocarcinoma, followed by abbreviation (AC)

MATERIALS AND METHODS

" Patient Database" i.e., subheading 3 of "MATERIALS AND METHODS" inserted on separate line as requested

DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION

I have added the following in the CONCLUSION section as a practical perspective for future studies:

“Future studies are needed to prospectively identify the rate of oligometastatic recurrence in oesophageal carcinoma in the context of today's advancing imaging technologies in order to update surveillance and treatment guidelines in line with those for cancers of the lower gastrointestinal tract.”

I have updated the STROBE checklist by assigning the appropriate page number (based on the “Manuscript revision preview” and uploaded in “Revision Files”

The automated manuscript editor did generate “ORCHID” during my manuscript revision and therefore was not edited. Can you tell me where this error is and how I can resolve it please?

I updated all of the author’s ORCID numbers bar one as I have not yet received a response from that author. I will continue to pursue this and update you.

The Conflict of Interest Disclosure form has now been filled in and uploaded

My CLA form has been uploaded. On the form only my name is given for “all authors”, is this correct as I am the only corresponding author?

1) Science editor:

The database of 205 patients diagnosed with esophageal cancer and treated was prospectively maintained. Active treatment and follow-up are very beneficial to improve the prognosis of patients. The sample size is small, and the conclusion is not very novel. It is unacceptable to have more than 3 references from the same journal. To resolve this issue and move forward in the peer-review/publication process, please revise your reference list accordingly*.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

On review of my reference list I note that there are 5 references from New England Journal of Medicine and 4 from Annals of Surgical Oncology. There are no more than 3 references from any other journal.

I have removed reference 6 (**Enzinger PC**, Mayer RJ. Esophageal Cancer. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2003;**349**(23): 2241-2252 [PMID: 14657432 DOI: 10.1056/nejmra035010]) from the 5th line of the first paragraph in the INTRODUCTION (original manuscript). The sentence, “and only 5% of these patients will be alive at 5 years^[4-6]”, is now supported by reference 5 alone (American Cancer Society. 2020 [cited 22 June 2020]. In: Cancer Facts and Statistics [Internet]. Available from: <https://cancerstatisticscenter.cancer.org/>) as a 5% 5-year survival rate in patients distant metastases (2011-2017) is reported by the American Cancer Society (2011-2017) on their website, negating the need for reference 4 and 6 here.

Additionally, I have removed reference 6 from 7th sentence of the 1st paragraph (original manuscript) as the remaining references (4, and 7-12) support the stated rates of recurrence.

I have removed reference 17 (**Walsh TN**, Noonan N, Hollywood D, Kelly A, Keeling N, Hennessy TP. A Comparison of Multimodal Therapy and Surgery for Esophageal Adenocarcinoma. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1996;**335**(7): 462-467 [PMID: 8672151 DOI: 10.1056/nejm199608153350702]) from both the 2nd and 3rd sentence of the 2nd paragraph of the INTRODUCTION (original manuscript) as the remaining references adequately support the text. Finally, I also have removed reference 19 (**Liu S**, Xi M, Yang H, Yang Y, Wu Y, Zhao L, Zhang P, Luo L, Liu M. Is There a Correlation Between Clinical Complete Response and Pathological Complete Response After Neoadjuvant Chemoradiotherapy for Esophageal Squamous Cell Cancer? *Annals of Surgical Oncology* 2015;**23**(1): 273-281 [PMID: 26215200 DOI: 10.1245/s10434-015-4764-0]) from the second sentence of the second paragraph in the INTRODUCTION (original manuscript), as again the remaining references adequately support the text.

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Please provide decomposable Figures (in which all components are movable and editable), organize them into a single PowerPoint file. Please authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022.

I have reviewed Table 1 and Table 2 in accordance with the standard three-line table format. I have edited the table attached to Figure 1 to meet the requirements of the standard three-line table (top line, bottom line and column line). I have organized Figure 1 into a PowerPoint file and it is now movable and editable). Figure 1 is original i.e., generated by one of the authors de novo and the appropriate copyright information has been added.

Kind Regards for the above feedback and guidance.

Yours sincerely,

Lianne Pickett

Corresponding author.