

Dear Editor,

We have recently submitted an invited manuscript (ID 65732 - "Hepatocellular carcinoma in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease - a growing challenge") in order to be appreciated for publication in your prestigious journal. Now, we would like to resubmit it after answering to the reviewers' comments (see below).

We would like to thank the reviewers for their thorough evaluation of our work and for their relevant suggestions. We hope that, after considering our answers to their comments and the changes in the manuscript, you will find it suitable for publication in its present form.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely yours,

Angelo Z. Mattos

Response to reviewers' comments:

Dear Reviewer 1,

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We are very glad that you were satisfied with our article.

Dear Reviewer 2,

Thank you very much for your comments on our paper. Your suggestions were highly relevant and certainly allowed us to improve our manuscript.

The following are the responses to each of your comments:

Comment 1 - We have rewritten the Introduction, using data from recent studies and simplifying sentences (page 6, lines 3-8 and 11-14). The sentence "...directed to certain subgroups at higher risks" was modified (page 6, lines 20-22).

Comment 2 – We have incorporated more details regarding the cited studies throughout the manuscript (page 15, lines 15-18 and 25-28; page 17, lines 26-30; page 18, lines 8-11).

Comment 3 – We have incorporated a Discussion section before Conclusions (page 18, line 28; page 19, lines 1-29).

Comment 4 – We have rewritten the Core Tip (page 5, lines 1-10).

Comment 5 – The figures were created by the authors for the article.

Once more, we would like to deeply thank you for reviewing our paper. We hope that you will now consider our manuscript suitable for publication in the World Journal of Hepatology.

Dear Reviewer 3,

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. Your comments on our paper were extremely useful and certainly led to its improvement.

The following are the responses to each of your comments:

Comment 1 – We have added a discussion on the impact of fibrosis, including reference to the study by Buchard et al. (page 11, lines 25-30; page 12, lines 1-19).

Comment 2 – We have included Table 1 (page 39).

Comment 3 – We have made the requested changes to Figure 1 (page 37).

Again, we would like to thank you for your suggestions. We are certain that the changes greatly improved our manuscript. We hope that you will now find it suitable for publication.

Dear Reviewer 4,

We would like to thank you for your comments, which have been very important in order to improve the quality of our manuscript.

The following are the responses to each of your comments:

Comment 1 – We have included the abbreviation “NAFLD” in the Abstract (page 4, lines 2, 5, 11, 15 and 18) and in the Key Words (page 4, line 22).

Moreover, “semi-annual” was replaced by “every 6 months” (page 4, line 12; page 16, lines 23 and 24; page 19, lines 22 and 23).

Comment 2 – We have added a discussion on the role of fibrosis (page 11, lines 25-30; page 12, lines 1-19).

Comment 3 – There already was some discussion on common mechanisms for NAFLD/NASH and HCC, especially in the section on “Immune aspects of NAFLD-related HCC”. Now we have further discussed common risk factors for HCC and NAFLD on page 11 (lines 15-24) and on page 12 (lines 11-19).

Comment 4 – We have added some discussion on pathways independent from fibrosis, including oxidative stress (page 10, lines 10-16; page 11, lines 15-24).

We deeply appreciate your contributions to our paper. We hope you will consider that it is now suitable for publication.