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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript treated an interesting and up-to-date topic - comparison open liver resection and RFA on the treatment of solitary 3-5cm hepatocellular carcinoma. However, this problem has been discussed widely in the literature. Generally, the article is well-written. But I have several concerns about it.

1/ There is no information about the period of the study (the period during which the patients underwent treatment, and the period for follow-up).

2/ The design of the study is not completely clear to me. It is written that the design of the study is retrospective but the authors declared a long-term follow-up. Is there a retrospective collection of the data, but prospective follow-up? Or, the policy of the hospital requires a postoperative observation for a 5-year period as a standard with recording the data of all patients.

3/ The criteria for choosing between the described methods are not completely clear, too. Only localization of the tumor is mentioned. In the discussion section, it is written the liver function or presence of cirrhosis is a factor for the treatment choice, as we all know, but there are no significant differences for that in the studied groups.

4/ It is stated that the sample is relatively large, but this cannot be concluded for sure, because we do not know what is the period of the study.

5/ A minor language revision is needed.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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