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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for allowing me to review this article detailing an experience with Endovac drainage of anastomotic leak post oesophagectomy. The paper describes the outcome for 20 patients managed this way. My comments as below.

ABSTRACT The abstract summarises the paper adequately. The introductory statement that EVAC works well in this situation suggests a bias that can only really be put in the conclusions if the results justify

INTRODUCTION The authors rightly state that there are multiple methods for dealing with an anastomotic leak post oesophagectomy. However they only detail one alternative, the placement of a SEM. There is no consensus that this is best practice and there are many other options that should be mentioned. The penultimate sentence of paragraph 2 does not make sense.

METHODS The paper does not explain patient recruitment. Was it all leaks? Consecutive patients? It is not clear what adjunct drains were allowed

RESULTS It is curious that clinical parameters such as inflammatory markers, organ failure etc were not included

DISCUSSION The discussion suffers from not comparing endovac therapy with other methods more widely. In particular there is no comparison with conservative treatment with drains and an nasogastric tube which likely would have resolved many of the included patients. The discussion of the one mortality should be intin the result section
**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.

No

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

No

**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 am able to assess the statistics

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