Peer Review File

Article Type: Review Article
Manuscript ID: APM-2019-Oligometastasis-02(APM-20-847)
Title: A review of ongoing trials of stereotactic ablative radiotherapy for oligometastatic disease in the context of new consensus definitions

We would like to thank the editor and reviewers for their careful review of our manuscript and thoughtful feedback. Please see below for responses to each of the comments.

Reviewer #1
High interest topic in oncology. Well written and clear. The Methodology is appropriate. To be accept

Minor(optionally):
Comment 1: line 112. When retrospective studyes are cited, I recommend include in refs some recent large reviews or manuscript regarding/including retrospective studies. For example:

Mazzola R, Jereczek-Fossa BA, Franceschini D, et al. Oligometastasis and local ablation in the era of systemic targeted and immunotherapy. *Radiat Oncol*. 2020;15(1):92.

Alongi F, Arcangeli S, Filippi AR, Ricardi U, Scorsetti M. Review and uses of stereotactic body radiation therapy for oligometastases. *Oncologist*. 2012;17(8):1100–1107.

We agree that including these references increases the utility of our review, and have added them in at line 113 (line 142 in the submitted version) and the reference list.

Reviewer #2
This is a very well-written summary of prior and ongoing clinical trials for OMD. I have no major criticisms or suggestions for improvements.

Minor comments-

Comment 1: The authors (some of them) wrote a similar paper "A Review of Ongoing Trials of Stereotactic Ablative Radiotherapy for Oligometastatic Cancers: Where Will the Evidence Lead?" (reference 2 in the paper and mentioned in the 1st sentence of the discussion). A brief description of the differences from this paper compared to the current paper would be helpful. The current paper is more updated (which the authors mention) and focuses more on the recent consensus definitions, and how differ-

ent studies fall within those consensus subgroups.

We have edited the first paragraph of the discussion section to more clearly outline differences between the previous and current reviews.

Comment 2: The first sentence of the abstract and the introduction states "Oligometastatic disease (OMD) is a rapidly evolving area of research." A disease is not an area of research so it may be more appropriate to say that "characterization of and optimal treatment for" OMD is a rapidly evolving area of research

Both the abstract and introduction have been edited to say "Characterization and treatment of oligometastatic disease (OMD) is a rapidly evolving area of research".

Comment 3: Local therapy may be better described as "metastasis-directed therapy". If the authors prefer the term local therapy it should be explicitly described as being directed towards metastatic disease.

The manuscript has been edited to replace local therapy with metastasis-directed therapy when referring to the use of local therapy for OMD. Other uses of local therapy have been clarified.

Comment 4: Please spell out the 1st instance of abbreviations-
ESTRO, ASTRO, EORTC

Full versions of each abbreviation are listed in the second paragraph of the introduction.

Comment 5: It may be appropriate to spell out STOMP (Surveillance or Metastasis-Directed Therapy for Oligometastatic Prostate) and SABR-COMET as well

Full names for both of these trials have been added.

Comment 6: The authors state (for Pembroke study): "Another single institutional retrospective analysis of 163 patients found that OMD patients had significantly longer median survival compared to those with oligoprogressive disease (34 vs. 33 months, $p = 0.02$)" This is a typo (it should be 34 vs. 22 months)

We appreciate the reviewer catching this typo and have updated this to be correct.

Comment 7: In Table 1, the columns with De Novo OMD and Genuine OMD are a bit crunched. Presumably this would be taken care of in the editing/proofing stage, though so as to not confuse the editing team, making this page landscape orientation will help

A landscape version of this table will be submitted to ensure clarity for the editing team.

I have no other comments and enjoyed reading this updated review of trials for OMD.