

Reviewer #1: Dear authors the manuscript is very good and covers an important issue. However, there are few comments mentioned in the manuscript file. Also, - Many paragraphs are without references. - The quality of the figures is poor. - The figures used are not cited. - The references for the data in the table should be mentioned.

Response: Thanks for your constructive suggestions. These suggestions make the manuscript much better. I have revised the manuscript base on your suggestions.

1. **references** marked in **red words** are added in page 3, page 4, Fig 1, Fig 2. Fig 3, Tables 1, Table 2.
2. [comments mentioned in the manuscript file] : Page 4, [LncRNA DLEU2 (deleted in lymphocytic leukemia 2).] is the name of one lncRNA not a complete sentence. I have double-checked the name.
3. [comments mentioned in the manuscript file] : Page 5, [should] is deleted as suggested. To avoid mis-understanding, the sentence [It is also unclear whether lncRNAs influence 10 HBV genotypes differently.] is deleted.
4. Regarding [The quality of the figures is poor], I have up-loaded the original PPT, the resolution should be good enough.

Reviewer #2: The paper consists of 2 parts, the first part discussing lncRNAs and HBV REPLICATIONS was not properly formulated with deficient citations and poor definition of abbreviations. I think the second part discussing the HCC is sufficient, and the paper should be restricted and reformulated on that subject.

Response: Thanks for your constructive suggestions. These suggestions make the manuscript much better. I have revised the manuscript base on your suggestions. To keep the integrity of this manuscript, the first part has not been deleted. **References [6,7,8,9]** marked in **red words** are added in page 4. **Words** marked in **red** were used to define the rcDNA.