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Reviewer's report:

Major
1. This manuscript is of interest but it needs major restructuring. It is not entirely clear what the message is. The title, aim and text do not closely align. The real aim is to describe in detail the components of validated QOL instruments at many time points during the 1st year after oesophagectomy. The reviewer is not convinced that the aim is to allow channelling of resources to specific time points. The authors should decide on the focus, either a descriptive study or allowing channelling of resources, and go with that. If the latter, the authors should elaborate in much more detail, what resources will be allocated to this patient group.

2. The patients are a subgroup of those included in an RCT which is described. This should be made even more explicitly clear in the introduction and aims. Further, the results should present the findings comparing the two groups (PPI vs no PPI). That was the purpose of the original study. The current findings should at least in part be presented that way.

3. It is possible for the authors to comment on power and sample size. The original RCT was powered to differing stricture rates in the groups?

4. A PRISM figure showing patient disposal would be helpful

5. The results appear contradictory - they need more explanation. The QLQ30 is reported as not influencing QOL in the first paragraph, yet is reported as significant in the subsequent sentences. The reviewer suspects this is just a matter of syntax and needs clearer text.

6. The Discussion should be simplified. It is very wordy and does not read easily. Leave the reader with a simple take home message

7. It should be clarified when the patients were randomized for inclusion. The reviewer suspects that they must have been randomized pre-operatively.

Minor
8. Figures 1, 3 and 5 add little and could probably be omitted

9. The authors should consider amending the title to reflect the emphasis of the paper.

10. "choked" has been mis-spelt

11. In the Introduction, paragraph 2 can be removed. Paragraph 4 should be
promoted to paragraph 2

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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