

ANSWERING REVIEWERS

Name of journal: *World Journal Transplantation*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 27460

Manuscript Type: Systematic Reviews

Lobar lung transplantation from deceased donors: A systematic review

Michael Eberlein, Robert M Reed, Mayy Chahla, Servet Bolukbas, Amy Blevins, Dirk Van Raemdonck, Alessia Stanzi, Ilhan Inci, Silvana Marasco, Norihisa Shigemura, Clemens Aigner, Tobias Deuse

Reviewer 1 (02496740):

Comment 1.1: Thanks for your good job. The topic is very hot and it need an overview in order to focus on the real state of the art. I will appreciate if you will improve the discussion about the need of ECMO after transplantation and which are the intra-op and, especially, complications concerning the infections and the LOS in ICU.

Response 1.1: Thank you very much for your helpful review and kind comments.

We have added on page 15 the following to the discussion: "Resource utilization following ddLLTx seems to reflect the pre-transplant high acuity of the recipients. In three studies reporting on postoperative ECMO needs, this ranged from 20-36% in the ddLLTx groups¹³⁻¹⁵. Four studies reported on ICU LOS and this ranged from 12 to 27 days in ddLLTx, compared to 4-6 days in conventional-LTx, **table 3**."

Unfortunately there was no detailed information available on infectious complications.

Reviewer 2 (02499955):

Comment 2.1: The authors have prepared an excellent review of the literature concerning the lobar transplantation. Work is well prepared and adds additional information obtained directly from the centers.

Response 2.1: Thank you very much for your helpful review and kind comments.

Comment 2.2: Few corrections are needed:

- a) Abstract: the bias among study should be underlined, especially for the inhomogeneity of preoperative conditions.

Response 2.2 a: Thank you for bringing up this important point. We added to the results section of the abstract the following statement: "The ddLLTx-group was often characterized by high acuity; however there was heterogeneity in transplant indications and pre-operative characteristics between studies"

b) Page 5: "No filters for..." this sentence is repeated.

Response 2.2 b: Thanks for bringing this to our attention. The duplicate sentence is eliminated now.

c) Page 9: please control the figure number.

Response 2.2 c: Thanks for bringing this to our attention. This is corrected now.

d) Page 10: please control the figure number.

Response 2.2d: Thanks for bringing this to our attention. This is corrected now.

e) Figure 4: the second part of the comment mentions symbols that are not included in the figure.

Response 2.2 e: Thanks for bringing this to our attention. The figure graphic was a previous version. We have corrected this now and the updated figure file includes the symbols that are mentioned in the figure legend.

f) Figure 5: the second part of the comment mentions symbols that are not included in the figure.

Response 2.2 f: Thanks for bringing this to our attention. The figure graphic was a previous version. We have corrected this now and the updated figure file includes the symbols that are mentioned in the figure legend.