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Reviewer’s report:

I believe there are no areas in this manuscript that require significant and essential revision.

On page 6, second line: RFA has been incorrectly described as FRA. This is a correction that would need to be made prior to the manuscript being published.

In a number of places within the manuscript some spelling errors have occurred.

The manuscript is well constructed and follows the format of a systematic review. Its conclusions are well supported by the data.

The topic of radiofrequency ablation versus hepatic resection remains controversial and the discussion is an important one to have. It is unfortunate that only one randomised controlled trial exists. It may be useful if the authors were able to at least look at the different outcomes that occurred with laparoscopic and percutaneous radiofrequency ablation versus open radiofrequency ablation. This would be an important area to segment and assess whether or not there were different outcomes associated with the procedures that have greater difficulty in assessing disseminated involvement within the liver. This would certainly add further weight to the study.

I would recommend that this be accepted after minor but essential revisions.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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