

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| TITLE (PROVISIONAL) | Development of a risk prediction tool for patients with locally advanced and recurrent rectal cancer undergoing pelvic exenteration: protocol for a mixed methods study |
| AUTHORS | Brown, Kilian; Solomon, Michael; Ng, Kheng-Seong; Sutton, Paul; Koh, Cherry; White, Kate; Steffens, D |

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| REVIEWER | Wang, Daorong Northern Jiangsu People's Hospital |
| REVIEW RETURNED | 04-Jul-2023 |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| GENERAL COMMENTS | Hello, the idea of your article is very novel, I can also see that you have done a lot of work on this. I think that your research is quite comprehensive, but the disadvantage is that each part of the discussion is not particularly detailed and in-depth, so I hope that you can discuss more in-depth, add some current research and controversial sections to make your article even better. Thank you |
|-------------------------|---|

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| REVIEWER | Komori, Koji Aichi Cancer Center |
| REVIEW RETURNED | 13-Aug-2023 |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| GENERAL COMMENTS | This paper was written about locally advanced and recurrent rectal cancer sufficiently. acceptable! |
|-------------------------|---|

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Dr. Daorong Wang, Northern Jiangsu People's Hospital, Clinical Medical College of Yangzhou University

Comments to the Author:

Hello, the idea of your article is very novel and I can also see that you have done a lot of work on this. I think that your research is quite comprehensive, but the disadvantage is that each part of the discussion is not particularly detailed and in-depth, so I hope that you can discuss more in-depth, add some current research and controversial sections to make your article even better. Thank you. [NOTE FROM THE EDITORS: Please note, a 'Discussion' section is entirely optional for protocol manuscripts, so this comment may be rebutted. The Introduction is the only required part of the manuscript that should cite and discuss the existing literature, in order to clarify the context and justify the rationale for the planned study. If a Discussion section is added, it should be added at the end of the main text, and must include discussion

of study limitations, including any key limitations already highlighted in the 'Strengths and limitations of this study' section after the abstract].

We thank the reviewer for considering our manuscript and for their helpful comments and queries. With the fact that a discussion section is optional and with the editors comments in mind, we have respectfully chosen not to include a discussion section for this manuscript. The relevant discussion points will be addressed individually in the manuscripts which arise from this study.

Reviewer: 2

Dr. Koji Komori, Aichi Cancer Center

Comments to the Author:

This paper was written about locally advanced and recurrent rectal cancer sufficiently. Acceptable!

Thank you for considering our manuscript and for your positive comments.

Thank you for considering this revised article for publication in BMJ Open.