

Answering reviewers:

Reviewer #1:

1. This editorial describes the application of ELRAT in perihilar cholangiocarcinoma, while clinical doctor confuse to choose beneficial populations. The Editorial need to be made in the review.

Preferable patient's population for ELRAT described in the editorial. Also the author added his comments about the issue you mentioned in the end of section 2: Perihilar CCA is not preferable patients population for the ELRAT. Despite good early results of the treatment in the article reported by Gu et al, it would be necessary to continue surveillance.

2. The fifth paragraph of the second part is a bit too long for the outcome of the article mentioned, which could add to the discussion and summary.

The mentioned paragraph has been diminished. There is no Discussion section in the Editorial article.

3. The fourth paragraph of Part Two refers to "higher morbidity", but not in the following paragraphs.

The fourth and fifth paragraphs are the one paragraph. They are not divided.

4. "Munugala et al added to FGFR the Isocitrate dehydrogenase (IDH) mutations accounted up to 15% in different subsets of CCA" The meaning of the number 15% in this sentence is unclear.

"15%" were substituted by "significant percentage"

5. The editorial should add more comments on the article by Hu et al.

More comments were added

6. Explain the abbreviations that appear for the first time in the article, such as "CCA", "LT", "ERAT".

Abbreviations now are explained at their first appearance in the abstract and in the main text.