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Reviewer's report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?

Yes

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript.

Comments:

I have no ethical concerns

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?

Yes

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify.

a. The relevant patient information, including:

- De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity)
- Main symptoms of the patient
- Medical, family and psychosocial history
- Relevant past interventions and their outcomes

b. The relevant physical examination findings
c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at $T = 0$, follow up at $T = 1$ month.

d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
   - Diagnostic methods
   - Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
   - Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable

e. Types and mechanism of intervention

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits

Comments: Points a-f are well presented

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?

Comments: major revision is required

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.

Yes

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?

Comments: Yes

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?
Comments: Yes

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?
The authors have presented a patient with recurrent HCC managed by percutaneous MW ablation in conditions of one-lung ventilation anesthesia.

I have the following comments:

1. Introduction section, paragraph 1. I suggest the authors to state LT as preferred treatment of choice when curative treatment options are considered instead of stating LT is the first treatment of choice.

2. The title of the case considers the procedure as minimally invasive surgery. However, description that follows indicates interventional procedure - US guided percutaneous MW ablation. The title should be changed accordingly.

3. The benefit of one-lung ventilation to treat hepatic dome lesion was clearly demonstrated. This is mainly related to better visualization of the tumor and achieving safe access/position of the needle. Still, the tumor is adjacent to diaphragm and its injury is possible. There are reports in the literature about perforation of the diaphragm as a consequence of thermal injury resulting from ablation of liver tumors adjacent to diaphragm. The authors did not use artificial ascites that is suggested in these cases. Additional clarification/discussion is needed to explain readers potential complications that may occur in this conditions.

4. I suggest authors to re-consider if Dindo-Clavien classification is applicable in this case
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