

We thank the reviewers and editors for their thoughtful comments which, without doubt, have helped in improving the manuscript. In the following, please find a point-by-point reply to the reviewer's and editor's concerns. We first present the reviewer's concerns in italics, followed by our reply in blue. We hope that our revisions will satisfy the reviewers and editors that the revised manuscript now merits publication in World Journal of Gastroenterology.

Reviewer 1 comments

1. As the authors mentioned, ^{64}Cu cause a limited evaluation of primary HCC in liver due to its high liver uptake. How can you overcome this limitation? The authors think small molecule ^{64}C -labeled tracers may be useful for HCC imaging? Discussion regarding these points would be helpful to the readers. A number of typographical errors should be corrected.

Response: We agree with the reviewer and revised manuscript with more detailed description of limited use of $^{64}\text{CuCl}_2$ -PET for evaluation of primary HCC due to physiologic background of copper uptake in the liver. We have indicated major use of $^{64}\text{CuCl}_2$ -PET for detection of extrahepatic HCC metastasis in the region of low physiological copper uptake, such as intracranial metastasis of HCC. A number of typographical errors have been corrected.

Reviewer 2 comments

1. I have only some minor comments concerning correction of some mistakes on this manuscript. Page 6 para 1: "Typically, the FDG-6-phosphatase is trapped..." should be changed to "FDG-6-phosphate is trapped within the cell..." Page 6 para 2: the last sentence of this paragraph is unclear and should be reformulated. There are some other typos in the manuscript.

Response: "Typically, the FDG-6-phosphatase is trapped..." has been changed to "FDG-6-phosphate is trapped within the cell..." . The last sentence of Page 6 para 2 has been reformulated. Other typos in the manuscript were corrected.

The manuscript edits

Response: We have made all changes recommended by the editors. This manuscript was written and revised by native English speakers (first author and another faculty member). We attempted CrossCheck analysis and were told that this should be done by publisher, not authors, when we asked for help from our institute. Some of references did not have PUBMED ID. Finally, Fig 1 and Fig 2 were prepared by staffs of illustration service in our department using software other than ppt file. We hope that high quality Fig 1 and Fig 2 will meet your requirements for publication.