

Response to reviewer

Reviewer 1.

1. The introduction, materials and methods in the paper work well, especially patients with a diagnosis of HCC were collected, a SEER database calculates COLI by utilizing a Family Budget Analysis done by Economic Policy Institute, COLI was elucidated based on family of two parents and one child to live in the county with a basic family expenditure such as housing, food, child care, transportation, health care, and taxes.

Response: Thank you for the comments.

2. Results are good and the resolutions of the are high, but the part of dicussion is not well discussed combined with results and references and should make some modifications.

Response: We appreciate your feedback. We have reviewed our discussion and have included additional studies to support our data. We have also revised different sections to emphasize our findings and what is known about the topic from previous studies (our references).

3.The language is not fluent ,suggesting that it should be edited by an English native editor.

Response: Thank you for your comments. We would like to note that this paper was drafted and edited by multiple native English-speaking authors under the direct supervision of a senior author, who is also a native English speaker. As such, we have reviewed the manuscript, as submitted in its original form, and included revisions to optimize its fluency.

4. The conclusion should be concise and only summarize the most important contribution of the research.

Response: We appreciate your valuable feedback. We have considered the feedback regarding the length of our discussion and have revised our paper to be more concise, emphasizing the most important contributions.

5. The few of references are not up-to-date,references of the last 10 years should be cited,please cite last 10 years references ,especially references for the last 5 years.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We agree that articles within the last 5-10 years should be included in this study. We included two additional studies (now reference 16 and 18) from 2019 and 2020 to have supporting evidence from within the last five years. As a significant takeaway point from our study, we have not removed any references to highlight the disparities that existed between 2007-2015. To support the findings of our study, we include studies from this time era in addition to more recent studies to demonstrate that racial and socioeconomic disparities continue to exist today.

As of now, 11/21 references (excluding SEER database) are from 2015-Present. 19/21 references are from the start of our study (2007) until the present. 2/21 references are from before 2007, highlighting cancer staging during that time era, and the other discussing mortality rates before our study range of 2007-2015 (intentionally).

Please make a little revisions, espically in the part of discussion, conclusions, references and langage-editing.

Response: We appreciate your input. We attempted to improve our manuscript based on your comments as detailed as above.

Editor.

The part of discussion is not well discussed combined with results and references. Reference need to be updated. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered.

Response: Please see the above comments for answers raised by the reviewer.

(1) The language classification is Grade C. Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies we recommend: <https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>;

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. As mentioned, the paper was drafted and edited by multiple native English-speaking authors under the direct supervision of a senior author, who is also a native speaker of English. We have reviewed the manuscript and updated it to optimize the language for the targeted audience.

(2) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor;

Response: The figures included in the manuscript are original, though we wanted to note that the figures provided were produced by statistical software.

(3) The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text; and

Response: Thank you for noting the need for the “Article Highlights” section. Our revisions should now include that section at the end of the main text.

(4) Please upload the primary version (PDF) of the Institutional Review Board’s official approval, prepared in the official language of the authors’ country to the system; for example, authors from China should upload the Chinese version of the document, authors from Italy should upload the Italian version of the document, authors from Germany should upload the Deutsch version of the document, and authors from the United States and the United Kingdom should upload the English version of the document, etc. Example: Download our sample of institutional review board approval, at <https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/287>. 6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Response: As our study utilized a publicly available, de-identified database, approval from an Institutional Review Board was not required to conduct this study. This was highlighted in the study design section of the Material and Methods portion of the paper.