

Peer Review File

Article Information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/atm-24-170>

Reviewer A

Nice editorial commentary on this article, it was fairly well written.

Only some minor comments to be addressed.

Specifically, on lines 25-26, the quality of a CBCT most definitely limits the confidence in delineation of organs at risk. However, if we are just talking about high dose radiotherapy it could also mention how it is not only inferior for delineation of OARs, which would be important for adaptive radiotherapy, but also for daily alignment if not using adaptive treatment. Additionally in line 141, consider removing the word “has”.

Reply: We have modified the text as advised – see Page 1, line 22-23

Reviewer B

This is an editorial related to the phase 2 SMART trial that was a single arm study evaluating ablative 5-fraction radiation therapy on a 0.35T MR-guided system for BRPC/LAPC. The primary endpoint which was related to acute toxicity was met and secondary outcomes including LC and OS were encouraging. The authors appropriately highlight the strengths and limitations of the study and conclude that the trial supports further evaluation of this treatment approach. The comments are objective and balanced, and are appropriate for publication. Perhaps would include a mention of the upcoming phase 3 NRG G011 trial and the ongoing Dutch LAPSTAR trial that are both evaluating ablative radiation therapy for LAPC.

Reply: The Dutch LAPSTAR trial has been added to the text, as has the NRG G011 trial. See line 136-137, page 4.

Reviewer C

The review is very interesting for this topic that is currently a talking point between GI radiation oncologist.

It would be interesting to report the prospective work of the Montpellier University in SMART pancreas.

[Reply: We have added this article. See line 56-58 on page 2.](#)

Reviewer D

This is a clear and well-structured editorial commentary that effectively summarizes the current evidence on the topic. The discussion of the study's strengths, limitations, and directions for future research is thorough and provides a balanced, critical evaluation. The work makes a valuable contribution to the field, offering meaningful insights for further exploration.

[Reply: Comments noted with thanks.](#)