

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/atm-23-1936>

Review Comments:

1. Despite authors have improved their paper, something is still missing. Particularly, it is not reasonable to see such a wide paper with so few figures, and the fig.1 is of poor quality and not really informative.

Response: Two additional figures were added in the revised manuscript. The quality of Fig.1 was also improved, and additional information was added to Fig.1.

2. Moreover, the tables report extensive text where the authors should better summarize, highlighting key-concepts.

Response: The information in tables were summarized by highlighting key-concepts as per suggestion by the reviewer.

3. The perspectives are too wide and should be rationalized in specific fields of interest, with a kind of SWOT analysis.

Response: SWOT analysis was included as Table 3 in the revised manuscript.

4. TRIALS should report numbers and state of the art.

Response: Additional information was added into the TRIALS stated in Table 2 as per suggestion by the reviewer.

5. References should be increased, as the text is wide and many sentences are not supported well.

Response: Additional references were included, and sufficient citation was provided in the revised manuscript. The revised manuscript contains more than 180 references, which are sufficient for the current review article.