

To the Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your insightful comments on our manuscript. We revised the text according to each of your comments and suggestions, which we believe has helped improve the quality of the manuscript. Please find our point-by-point responses to your comments below. We hope that this manuscript is suitable for publication in your journal.

Dear Editor, thank you so much for inviting me to revise this manuscript about cholangiocarcinoma. This study addresses a current topic. The manuscript is quite well written and organized. English should be improved. The tables are comprehensive and clear. The introduction explains in a clear and coherent manner the background of this study. We suggest the following modifications:

- Introduction section: although the authors correctly included important papers in this setting, we believe the authors should discuss and briefly report the evolving systemic treatment scenario for cholangiocarcinoma and the association of locoregional approaches such as ablative modalities and systemic therapies, and some recently published papers should be added within the introduction (PMID: 32994319; PMID: 32396398 ; PMID: 33645367 ; PMID: 33592561), only for a matter of consistency. We think it might be useful to introduce the topic of this interesting review.
- The authors should expand some sections, including a more personal perspective to reflect on. For example, they could answer the following questions – in order to facilitate the understanding of this complex topic to readers: What are the knowledge gaps and how do researchers tackle them? How do you see this area unfolding in the next 5 years? We think it would be extremely interesting for the readers. However, we think the authors should be acknowledged for their work. In fact, they correctly addressed an important topic, the methods sound good and their discussion is well balanced. We believe this article is suitable for publication in the journal although some revisions are needed. The main strengths of this paper are that it addresses an interesting and very timely question and provides a clear answer, with some limitations. We suggest a linguistic revision and the addition of some references for a matter of consistency. Moreover, the authors should better clarify some points.

Response: We really appreciate your valuable and insightful evaluation of our manuscript. Accordingly, we included the following information in the Introduction section: “Besides, it has been suggested that it is effective in prolonging survival for extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma (eCCA). Since the prognosis of eCCA is poor and numerous patients are unresectable at the time of diagnosis, ID-RFA has attracted huge attention and has high expectations as a feasible alternative.”

Also, we cited these article on the manuscript. Additionally, we think, while robust evidence is lacking, there are still many unresolved issues, such as differences in tumor localization between the hepatic hilum and distal bile duct, the number of ablation applications performed, and so on. In the future, in addition to accumulating further evidence, it is necessary to establish its usefulness, clarify its indication, and develop an innovative device that can perform appropriate ablation for all lesions.

This a very usefull review of Intraductal radiofrequency ablation for Cholangiocarcinoma, highlighting the main topics regarding the subject, the informartion are updated, the text is concise and the sessions are clearly displayed for the reader. Congratulations for the authors. English polishing is not needed.

Response: We really appreciate your valuable and insightful evaluation of our manuscript, and are very happy to hear your comment.