

Peer Review File

Article information: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/gpm-20-63>

Reviewer A

1. It is not clear from the title that this is a review and not original research. I would advice to add "A review of the literature" at the end of the title.

Reply 1. The title has been edited accordingly into: "The role of multiple bowel resections in advanced ovarian cancer: Survival and surgical outcomes - a narrative review"

2. The METHODS section is very small and needs to be more detailed. It needs to state that this is not a systematic review of the literature. It needs to state how many papers were identified and reviewed, how many were excluded and why. It needs to state clearly that this a descriptive review of relevant papers and there has been no systematic analysis of results.

Reply 2. We thank the reviewer for the appropriate comments and suggestions.

The Methods section has been enlarged and we discussed in depth the type of review we made (e.i., narrative / non-systematic review, including only the most significant papers that focused on this specific topic. We also stated that the inclusion/exclusion of the studies has been merely based on authors' arbitrary criteria. Also, we reported this as a potential limit of our conclusions.

3. Also in the methods section multiple bower resection should be defined.

Reply 3. Again, we thank the reviewer for the suggestion. Multiple bowel resection (MBR) has been properly defined as requested.

4. All content up until page 9 is very well written and informative. However, the rest of the content starting with the subheading "the role of bowel resections in debulking surgery for ovarian cancer" is not really relevant with the title of the review and according to my opinion should be deleted keeping the last paragraph about the SCORPION trial in the main part of the manuscript. This is because everything mentioned after page 9 is an overall look into the surgical management of advanced ovarian cancer and not really related to multiple bowel resections.

Reply 4. We agree with the reviewer. We lightened the content of the subheading "the role of bowel resections in debulking surgery for ovarian cancer" and we included it in the section above. Conversely the paragraph about the SCORPION trial has been kept as it is.

5. A few spelling mistakes should also be corrected. For instance, Line 76: Mortality instead of morality

Reply 5. The all manuscript has been checked and spelling mistakes have been corrected.

Reviewer B

Thank you for the opportunity to review your manuscript.

I think this is an important manuscript because complete surgery is really important for ovarian cancer and directly affects the patient's prognosis.

Major revision

1. I do not understand the final conclusion of the author. It is just a mixed list of papers that have been reported so far. The necessity of intestinal colectomy and the importance of complete surgery have already been described in many papers, and this paper is just an overview of them. If you are going to discuss whether or not to perform a combined bowel resection, you should conduct a systematic review of the prognosis and risk of complications.

Reply 1. We thank the reviewer for the comment. The manuscript has been edited as suggested. We specified the nature of the study, particularly stating that this is a narrative review and we did not focus on some specific aspects (such as risks of complications) which might be addressed in further investigations.

2. The same information is repeated over and over again, making it very difficult to read. It would be better to avoid duplicate content and review the overall structure.

Example) Page10

The role of bowel resections in debulking surgery for ovarian cancer...

The outline of this section is duplicated in the introduction. It would be more compact and easier to read if the extraneous content were omitted.

Reply 2. Again, we agree with the reviewer. As suggested also by Reviewer 1, we lightened the content and tried to omit extraneous topics and duplicated sentences. We do hope it has become much easier to read.

Minor revision

Comment 1. Page3 line 6, line7 ovarian cancer ... OC?

Reply 1. Changes made as suggested.

Comment 2. Page4 line32-33 multiple bowel resections...MBR

Reply 2. Changes made as suggested.

Comment 3. Page6 line 57 OC...ovarian cancer? This is the only abbreviation.

Reply 3. Changes made as suggested

Comment 4. Page 7 line 69 multiple bowel resections... MBR Use abbreviations as appropriate.

Reply 4. Changes made as suggested.

Comment 5. Page 13-14 Other important clinical trial results have been published and should be added.

Onda T, et al. Comparison of survival between primary debulking surgery and neoadjuvant chemotherapy for stage III/IV ovarian, tubal and peritoneal cancers in phase III randomised trial. Eur J Cancer. 2020 May;130:114-125

Reply 5. Reference added as indicated.

Comment 6 Page 14 Line 214

In addition to the TRUST trial, there is also the SUNNY trial.

Study of Upfront Surgery Versus Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy in Patients with Advanced Ovarian Cance (SUNNY trial).

Reply 6. Reference added as indicated.