

RESPONSE TO REVIEWER

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: In this manuscript authors have performed a review of the literature for the topic Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation in Lung transplantation. This is a nicely well-written narrative review in a hot topic performed by a clinical and research team with relevant expertise. I have only minor comments to add. Minor comments I would suggest adding relevant figures illustrating ECMO configurations Please discuss further the indications for VV-ECMO versus VA-ECMO versus VVA-ECMO. Selection of ECMO configuration might be challenging particularly if hypoxia and / or hypocapnia are combined with haemodynamic compromise and viceversa. Please clarify what are the proposed clinical, metabolic and haemodynamic criteria for each configuration. This information would be essential for the readers of the review.

RESPONSE

We really appreciate the reviewer's suggestion. We have added relevant figures representing the different cannulation strategies (central vs peripheral). In addition, as requested, we have better clarified the criteria of each configuration.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This review examines the use of ECMO in association with lung transplantation. It provides a nice overview of the various techniques of ECMO (VV, VA, VVA), and the appropriateness of use of ECMO as bridge to transplantation, intraoperative ECMO, and post-operative ECMO. Consequently, it provides the reader with all the potential scenarios when ECMO could be useful. The manuscript needs editing by a native English speaker! There are many instances when words are missed out (primarily, 'the' and 'a', but other also). In addition, the text does not flow because the authors have used paragraph format for almost every sentence!

RESPONSE

We thank you the reviewer for this suggestion. We have revised the english language of the manuscript as requested and reorganized the text structure.