

Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

Point 1: 1. Concerning the abstract, I would specify that the texture analysis is both qualitative (performed by radiologists) and quantitative (performed by a software).

Response 1: Edited.

Point 2: 2. In the introduction: "Recent studies have sought to use TA to predict MVI on [please delete: "both"] MRI and have identified certain imaging and textural features (such as tumour entropy) that may be associated with bad tumour behaviour [14,15]."

Response 2: Edited.

Point 3: 3. Concerning exclusion criteria: What about the presence of macro-vascular invasion at preoperative imaging? I believe it should be an exclusion criteria.

Response 3: Patients with gross vascular invasion are generally not considered for surgical resection. They are thus a subset of the patients exclude as our study population only included patients who underwent hepatectomy.

Point 4: 4. Chapter RESULTS: the sentence "The pre-operative serum γ -glutamyltranspeptidase (GGT; $p < 0.01$) was found to be statistically significant between the two groups." Should be changed with "we found a statistically significant difference of the pre-operative serum γ -glutamyltranspeptidase (GGT; $p < 0.01$) level between the two groups."

Response 4: Edited

Point 5: 5. Similar in the following sentence: what is statistically significant is the difference in rates of imaging features between the two study groups, not the imaging features in se.

Response 5: Edited

Point 6: 6. Figure 3 and related figure description do not add to the manuscript, please improve (for example showing all the qualitatively detectable images characteristics assessed in the current study and describing them in the description) or delete.

Response 6: Removed Figure 3

Point 7: 7. In tables 1 and 2 the % values should be recalculated. For example, Gender Male, n (%) 43 (86) 12 (12/15=80%) 31 (31/35=88%) This will allow a better comparison between incidences in the two groups and an easier assessment of differences between groups.

Response 7: Edited

Point 8: 8. the authors should highlight the low number of study patients, which may account for the the lack of statistically significant differences among two study groups in terms of both clinical and radiological characteristics between two study groups.

Response 8: Added a line in the limitations paragraph: The low sample size may also account for the relative paucity of statistically significant differences among the two study groups in terms of both clinical and radiological characteristics.

Point 9: 9. I would add the column "TOTAL" in table 2, similar to table 1.

Response 9: Added