

RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Firstly, We'd like to thank you and the reviewers for the possibility to revise our paper.

Firstly, considering reviewer#2's comments we edited the title to be more fitted to the main topics of the paper.

In the uploaded revised manuscript, you will find the underlined changes made in response to the Reviewers. In this letter, we also indicated how we have dealt with the Reviewer's comments.

We are enclosing a point-by-point reply to the Reviewer's comments.

Finally, due to the new included paragraphs, references list was refreshed as appropriate.

The final version of the manuscript has been edited again by a native English speaker.

Finally, on behalf of all the authors, I would like to thank you for your consideration of this paper.

Reviewer #1

Q: The author has traced back the role and significance of imaging evaluation for judgment of whether liver malignancies recur after treatment. The author did an extensive literature review, with a result that it is widely known that the relevant imaging examination and evaluation is quite valuable in the assessment of recurrence of liver malignancies. However, the author did not make dependent elaboration on difference between imaging characteristics of liver malignant tumor after recurrence and primary tumor. In especial, there is lack of the review that the imaging features of recurrent tumors after drug chemotherapy compared with those before treatment. At the same time, there is also a lack of review and elaboration of the commonly used nuclear medicine in detection and evaluation of tumor recurrence. In view of the above-mentioned

reasons, the retrospective literature is in lack of medical depth, which requires to be further expended and improved respectively.

A: We'd like to thank the reviewer for these precious comments about our paper. We apologize to produce a superficial discussion regarding tumor features after chemotherapy and, as kindly requested, we added more information in the specific section. Even if we know that nuclear medicine represents an important field of clinical study and in everyday practice, we decided to not include it in the first version of the manuscript. Thank the reviewer#1 comments, we added a specific subparagraph regarding these important diagnostic tools, to complete our report.

Reviewer #2

Thanks for the opportunity to review the REVIEW "Non-surgical approach to recurrent (RHCC): from locoregional treatments to immunotherapy". The authors reviewed that the current clinical practice by underlying the importance of the radiological approach both in the diagnosis and treatment of RHCC. In order to improve the manuscript, the following points need further consideration: The radiology-related keywords were added to the current title might be appropriate. The application of CEUS to the diagnosis and monitoring of HCC/RHCC needs to be expanded appropriately.

A: We'd like to thank the reviewer for the constructive comments about our paper. We completely agree with you regarding the radiology-related keywords and we edited the title and the running title as appropriate. On the other hand, we completely agree with you regarding the usefulness of CEUS in the diagnosis and follow-up of HCC patients and we added a specific paragraph in the text to complete our literature review.