

Feb 08, 2022

Dear Prof. Peter Schemmer Editor-in-Chief, World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Thank you very much for your constructive and insightful comments on the manuscript entitled “*Transarterial Chemoembolization Failure/Refractoriness: A Scientific Concept or Pseudo-proposition?*”.

We have made the revision based on the comments from the editors and reviewers. The responses have been given in the “Reply to Editors’ and Reviewers’ Comments” separately point-by-point for their concerns. All the revisions are annotated and using the track changes function in the annotated copy. The grammar and expression in the revised manuscript has been polished by a professor.

Thank you for the opportunity of revising the manuscript, and we are looking forwards to hearing from your favorable decision.

Sincerely Yours,

## Reply to Editors' and Reviewers' Comments

### For Science Editor:

**Q1.** This article reviewed the role of TACE in intermediate and advanced stage HCC. Indeed, TACE is widely applied in all stages of HCC in current clinical practice. The review article might provide some information for current application of TACE in treating HCC patients.

*Reply: We are highly appreciated for the comments. In addition, we have polished up the manuscript with the help of a professor.*

### For Editorial Office Director:

**Q1:** I recommend the manuscript to be published in the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery.

*Reply: Thank you very much for your advice and we submit this manuscript to WJGS.*

### For Editor in Chief:

**Q1.** I recommend the manuscript to be published in the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

*Reply: Thank you very much for your advice and we submit this manuscript to WJGS.*

### For Reviewer #1:

None

### For Reviewer #2:

**Q1.** Patients with HCC constitute a heterogenous group and the treatment modalities need to be individualized.

**Reply:** *Thank you very much. We could not agree more with your comments which have been repeatedly emphasized in this manuscript.*

**Q2. The review can be shortened to be precise to address the issue of TACE failure/refractoriness.**

**Reply:** *Thank you very much for your constructive comments. We have deleted two paragraphs; one discusses the liver function deterioration after TACE (subtitle: **Live function damage following TACE**) and the other compares the difference between mRECIST criteria and RECICL. In addition, a table (**Table.2**) and many sentences are deleted.*

**Q3. The conclusion needs to be unambiguous.**

**Reply:** *An unambiguous conclusion is warranted for a mini-review. We do not entirely support the definitions in current concept concerning TACE failure/refractoriness. Thus, we have revised the conclusion, making it clearly.*

**Q4. The article needs language/grammar revision.**

**Reply:** *Thank you very much for your comments and we have polished up the manuscript with the help of a professor.*