

## **Editorial Board:**

Thank you for allowing us to submit a revised version of our manuscript entitled “**Comparison of Open and Closed HIPEC: Results from the US HIPEC Collaborative**” for consideration for publication in *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*.

Below you will find our responses and revisions to the thoughtful and constructive suggestions provided to us from the peer reviewers and editorial staff. The changes in the manuscript are in **red font** for ease of identification.

## **Peer-Review**

### **Reviewer #1:**

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The authors investigated the impact of HIPEC method on post-operative and long-term survival outcomes in a retrospective multi-institutional caseload. The manuscript is well written, concise and the aim is clearly stated. Method and result sections are easy to follow. Statistical analysis seems appropriate. The results are well discussed. The literature is quite appropriate but I suggest to substitute ref.1 with a systematic review for colorectal and add a systematic review paper for mesothelioma after the ref.2.

Thank you for your feedback regarding the appropriateness of our references. We have made the following changes according to your recommendation:

The following reference was substituted for reference 1 as a systematic review for colorectal peritoneal carcinomatosis:

1 Yan TD, Black D, Savady R, Sugarbaker PH. Systematic review on the efficacy of cytoreductive surgery combined with perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy for peritoneal carcinomatosis from colorectal carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 2006; 24: 4011-4019 [PMID: 16921055 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2006.07.1142]

The following reference was added after reference 2 as a systematic review for peritoneal mesothelioma:

3 Helm JH, Miura JT, Glenn JA, Marcus RK, Larrieux G, Jayakrishnan TT, Donahue AE, Gamblin TC, Turaga KK, Johnston FM. Cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal

chemotherapy for malignant peritoneal mesothelioma: a systematic review and meta-analysis.  
Ann Surg Oncol 2015; 22: 1686-1693 [PMID: 25124472 DOI: 10.1245/s10434-014-3978-x]

Some specific comments: The main result of this paper is that there is not significant difference in post-operative outcome (complications, readmission etc.) between the two groups. The article suggest that open technique is more cost-effective (mean operative time significantly shorter 6.7 versus 8.5), but this economic advantage is explained by the higher mean PCI in the closed group (higher PCI means more length of surgery). Please add this comment in the discussion section.

Thank you for this comment. We agree that the difference in mean operative time is not just a reflection of the technique and is very likely being influenced by the PCI. The following sentence is included in our discussion section to address this (page 13):

Median operative time was longer in the closed HIPEC group (8.5 hours vs. 6.7 hours) though this may have been more of a result of the greater PCI and need for operative procedures than the technical aspects of HIPEC administration.

The authors should also underline that the oncologic prognostic impact of the two study groups is strongly affect by the unbalance of indications and heterogeneity of the population treated. Good paper.

Very good point. We have updated and included the following sentences in our discussion (page 14):

Practice and treatment algorithms, including indications for surgery, likely differed across time and between institutions in this study, though this allows the results to be more generalizable to the entire country, rather than representing a single institution.

The study population was a heterogeneous group of diverse histologies, though subgroup analysis was performed on those histologies with adequate numbers for analysis (e.g. appendiceal and colorectal).

**Reviewer #2:**

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Change conclusions

We appreciate your review of our manuscript but are unclear about what part of our conclusion you would recommend us changing. We have incorporated changes based on comments from the other reviewer and hope that these will be satisfactory to your re-review.

## Editorial Office Review

**(1) Science Editor:** Recommend for potential acceptance.

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript is a retrospective study of open versus closed hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy. The topic is in the scope of WJGO.

(1) Classification: B and C.

(2) Summary of the peer-review report: The manuscript is well written, concise and the aim is clearly stated. Method and result sections are easy to follow. Statistical analysis seems appropriate. The results are well discussed. The literature is quite appropriate. This is a good paper.

(3) Format: Four tables and two figures. Eighteen references were cited, including three references published in the last three years. No self-citation.

2 Language evaluation: A and B. The authors are native English speakers.

3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided biostatistics review certificate. The authors signed the conflict-of-interest disclosure form. All authors should sign their signature in copyright license agreement. The institutional review board approval form was uploaded. The written informed consent was waived. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck investigation and the Bing search.

4 Supplementary comments: (1) Unsolicited manuscript. (2) Without financial support. (3) Corresponding author has published two articles in WJGO.

**(2) Editorial Office Director:**

1 Scientific quality: I have checked the comments made by the science editor, and I basically agree with the science editor. The topic of the paper is within the scope of the WJGO.

(1) Classification: Grade B, and Grade C;

(2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: Reviewer 01192203 summarized that the manuscript is well written, concise and the aim is clearly stated and gave some suggestions of revising. Reviewer 03732300 suggested the authors to changing the conclusion; and

(3) Format: I have checked the manuscript, and I agree with the science editor.

2 Language evaluation: The authors are native English speakers.

3 Academic norms and rules: I have checked the documents, including the Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form, Copyright License Agreement, Biostatistics Review Certificate, and Institutional Review Board Approval, all of which are qualified. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search.

4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. Supported by National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences, and NIH.

5 Issues raised:

(1) I found that the author contributions is missing. Please provide the author contributions.

**This has been added and can be found on page 3.**

(2) I found the article highlight section is missing. Please write the “article highlights” section at the end of the main text;

**The Article Highlights section has been added to the end of the main text (pages 15-16).**

(3) I found that the figures can't be edited. Please provide the original figure documents. All submitted figures, including the text contained within the figures, must be editable. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.

All figures have been prepared in an editable format.

(3) I found that approved grant application form is not submitted. Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s).

I have uploaded a grant approval form.

6 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

**(3) Company Editor-in-Chief:** I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted with minor revisions. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.