

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tcr-23-611>

Review Comments

Reviewer A

Comment 1: Authors performed a well written commentary about an article of interest. I think it could be accepted in the present form.

Reply1: We thank the reviewer for the appreciation of our work.

Reviewer B

Comment 2: I'm quite confused as to the argument the authors are trying to make in this editorial. The authors first begin MR-linacs, stating that “the translation of such technology (MRgRT) into tangible clinical benefit is a matter of debate”. First, I think this is a little unfair – MRgRT is well and successfully implemented in many centres across the UK and Europe. Do the authors mean it is debatable whether evidence exists showing that SBRT MRgRT has significant reduced toxicity, especially as they go on to discuss results of clinical trials in the next paragraph?

They seem to swap between MRgRT and SBRT with different image guidance, and it all gets a little confusing.

Reply2: we thank the reviewer for the valuable comment. We apologize if the statement was not clear. We reformulated the sentence as follows: “However, to date, the translation of such technology into an improved clinical outcome compared to state of the art linac-based technology is less clearly established.”

Comment 3: They then discuss the PACE-B and PATRIOT trials in the paragraph beginning on line 59. Some more detail of the PACE-B and PATRIOT trials would be useful, e.g what were these trials were testing? The authors should state clearer what they conclude from these trials in terms of their argument.

Reply3: Thank you for letting us notice that. We briefly report the aims and the type of study for both the PACE-B and the PATRIOT. (line 66 and line 71 respectively)

Comment 4: If MRgRT, I think discussion of adaption techniques, e.g. use of adapt to position and adapt to shape would be a more useful discussion.

Reply4: *thanks for your valaубel suggestion. We discussed this point adding a new reference (ref 19).*

ref. Added [19]: - *Acute toxicity comparison of magnetic resonance-guided adaptive versus fiducial or computed tomography-guided non-adaptive prostate stereotactic body radiotherapy: A systematic review and meta-analysis*

Comment 5: I'm not sure why the authors have named their article "when size matters" – I understand this relates to treatment margins, however there is not a strong enough focus on treatment margins, and particularly for toxicity.

Reply5: *thanks for your comment. We proposed the following title: "Magnetic Resonance Imaging-Guided stereotactic body radiotherapy for prostate cancer: more than a simple "MIRAGE"?"*

Comment 6: I'm not sure what the figure is meant to show? The margins are not isotropic – not sure this figure adds anything to the message of the piece? Would be better off showing this in the context of anatomy?

Reply6: *Thank you for the comments on the figure. Due to the confusing interpretation, we decided to remove it from the editorial.*

Comment 7: NCCN guidelines – please add a reference.

Reply7: *Thank you, we added the reference related to the abovementioned guidelines.*

Ref. [2]