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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting retrospective study performed on patients undergoing Thoracoscopic laparoscopic oesophagectomy at a single institution over a 10 year period.

I have some comments that need to be addressed.

It is mentioned that a total of 105 patients underwent oesophagectomy during this period. 20 were excluded as these were performed as open surgeries. Seventy five patients were included- this leaves 10 patients unaccounted for. Can the authors advise as to why these were excluded.

The choice for the route of reconstruction may have some influence on the outcomes. Can the Authors advise why the post sternal route was chosen in the vast majority of cases rather than the posterior mediastinal route? The post sternal route is longer and can have the potential to place tension on the gastric conduit.

The overall anastomotic leak rates are high as compared to world literature. Can the authors provide any explanation for this as well as the long length of stay overall?

The overall surgical time appears quite long as well. Can the authors elaborate on single lung ventilation time?

Was delayed emptying of the gastric conduit studied?

Was there a multi and univariate analysis performed to see which factors may be predictive or was CRP on POD 1 and CPK chosen empirically based on some prior studies? were other factors such as postoperative development of new AF or inotrope requirement post op looked at?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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