

Peer-review report

Reviewer #1:

Thank you for your review.

Reviewer #2:

Thank you for your review.

Reviewer #3:

In answer to your major comments:

- Point 1: The abstract was shortened
- Point 2: The introduction was shortened
- Point 3: The significant difference in terms of PTR rates in our population was added to the limits of our study
- Point 4: The sentence "Right sided tumors seem to gain more benefit from such strategy" was removed

In answer to your minor comments:

- Point 1: The manuscript was reviewed
- Point 2: The missing definitions were added for the abbreviations

Reviewer #4:

Thank you for your review.

Reviewer #5:

- Point 1: Unfortunately, the reasons behind PTR were not collected in the medical files, this was pointed out in the limits to our study in the discussion. Therefore we are not able to provide the selection criteria for PTR.
- Point 2: this issue was addressed
- Point 3: the statistical analyze was carried out in the synchronous population only. The results are very similar to the one observed when the metachronous population was also included. The manuscript was rewritten with these new results based only on the synchronous population.