

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Minor revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** The present study has impeccable methodology with illustrative figures, and a very concise discussion of the efficacy and safety of two neoadjuvant therapies in patients with EC based on the meta-analysis of relevant data, so as to provide an evidence-based medical basis for the treatment of patients with EC. The research ideas are clear and the work is serious. I have only few small remarks that authors should address properly. - Abstract should be presented within subsections i.e. background, method, results, as well as conclusion. - Core tip is missing. - You can improve the discussion part. Please summarize the findings of results. Congratulations on your excellent work. I recommend to accept the manuscript after minor revision.

**Response to Reviewer #1:** Thank you for your review and positive feedback on the methodology, figures, and discussion in our manuscript. We appreciate your suggestions for improvement and will address them accordingly. We will include subsections in the abstract to provide a clearer structure. We apologize for missing the Core Tip and will add it appropriately. Furthermore, we have enhanced the discussion section by summarizing the findings of the results. Thank you for recommending acceptance of the manuscript after minor revision.

Reviewer #2:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Minor revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** It is a well structured manuscript and an interesting topic. The Authors explored the efficacy and reliability of nCRT and nCT in the prevention and treatment of EC, using three RCTs studies and 17 case-control and cohort studies to describe the course of treatment in detail with nCRT and nCT and to record changes in patients before and after treatment. The authors finally found the 3-year overall survival rate, pathological complete response rate, and R0 clearance rate of nCRT for EC were better than those of nCT, and the 3-year overall survival rate of esophageal squamous cell carcinoma was more obvious. It may provide an evidence-based medical basis for the treatment of patients with EC. The manuscript is a good meta-analysis. Good Introduction and materials and Methods. Relevant and informative images and tables. The Discussion sound well. Complete the References.

**Response to Reviewer #2:** Thank you for your review and acknowledging the well-structured manuscript and the relevance of the topic. We appreciate your positive comments on our exploration of the efficacy and reliability of nCRT and nCT in EC treatment. We have addressed your suggestions. Thank you for recognizing our meta-analysis as a valuable contribution.