

Reply to reviewers

Reviewer 1

1. This is a review article, not a systematic review. Thus it has the potential bias in choosing the articles to review.

(Our reply) We agree with the reviewer. We declared the potential bias in Conclusion. Please check it.

2. It is not clear whether all the articles on deceased-donor liver transplantation were whole liver transplantation. If this is the case, the authors should state this very clearly at the beginning of the article.

(Our reply) We appreciate for the appropriate indication by the reviewer. We state that all articles cited in this review were of whole liver deceased-donor liver transplantation in Introduction. It is also stated in the beginning of "Studies comparing LDLT and DDLT for HCC patients" section.

3. Reference 4 is incomplete.

(Our reply) We completed the bibliography of Reference 4.

4. It is not clear from the title of the article that this is a review article.

(Our reply) We changed the title as follows; Living-donor versus deceased-donor liver transplantation for patients with hepatocellular carcinoma; current opinions in literature review

Reviewer 2

1. Some spelling errors need to be carefully corrected.

(Our reply) According to the reviewer's indication, we did the proof-reading again meticulously, and corrected some errors.

2. The article should be published in the form of review.

(Our reply) Yes, we submitted the present manuscript as a review article. We hopefully expect the manuscript to be published as such, in "World Journal of Hepatology".