

Peer Review File

Article Information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/ales-23-27>

Review comments

This is very well written and summarizes these techniques very well. I would agree with publishing as is. My only comment is that RFA is currently being studied as an alternative to active surveillance in many IRB approved protocols across the country. This was not mentioned in the review.

Editorial comments

Many thanks to the authors for their efforts in this manuscript. Following are some suggestions to improve the article.

Comment 1: Title page

1. Please fill out the complete information of the authors' affiliation including the city and country where the affiliation is located.

We thank the reviewers for the feedback. We have adjusted this to reflect our city and country.

2. Author contribution describes the contribution each author made to the manuscript. The 'Author contributions' section should be presented as follows:

- (I) Conception and design:
- (II) Administrative support:
- (III) Provision of study materials or patients:
- (IV) Collection and assembly of data:
- (V) Data analysis and interpretation:
- (VI) Manuscript writing: All authors
- (VII) Final approval of manuscript: All authors

Note: With VI and VII, "All authors/Both authors (when there are only two authors)" is obligatory, while the other credits are case-based; The 'Author contributions' section is not required when there is only one author.

We thank the reviewers for the feedback. We have adjusted the "Author Contribution" section at the end of the manuscript.

Comment 2: [Reference](#)

1. The citation of references is missing in the main text.
2. In text, references should be identified using numbers in round brackets and located before the period. Where more than one number is required, they should appear consecutively [e.g., "cancer-related mortality (19)"; "denocarcinoma

(29,30)”; “raised significantly (15, 20, 31-33)”. References (including in the text, tables and figure legends) should be numbered consecutively and consistently according to the order in which they first appear in the text.

We thank the reviewers for the feedback. We have adjusted all pages to include the citations accordingly.

3. For reports with up to three authors, all the author names should be listed. However, if a report has more than three authors, the first three authors should be listed followed by “et al.”

Comment 3: Format

1. The ‘Abstract’ of Review Article is unstructured and requires 200 to 350 words. Your abstract does not meet this requirement. There are only 193 words here.
2. We hope authors use a structured introduction to increase readability: 1) Background, 2) Rationale and knowledge gap, 3) Objective.
3. Please add an ‘[Acknowledgements](#)’ section.
 1. All contributors who do not meet the criteria for authorship should be listed in the ‘Acknowledgments’ section.
 2. Financial and material support should also be acknowledged.
 3. The ‘Acknowledgments’ section should also detail all funding sources for the work in question. There must be a section “Funding” within the “Acknowledgments” section. If the research was carried out without funding, "None" should be stated in this section.
4. Please add a ‘[Footnote](#)’ section.

We thank the reviewers for the feedback. We have adjusted or included 1) the abstract to meet the word requirement, 2) structured introduction, 3) added an Acknowledgements section with financial and material supports with funding subsection, 4) Footnote section, and 5) COI forms.