

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: I read this manuscript with great interest. This manuscript is well written. The methods are described in detail, and results are well discussed. In my opinion, this manuscript can be accepted for publication after a minor editing. Thank you.

Dear Reviewer #1,

First of all, we thank you for taking the time to review our manuscript carefully and for your recognition of our work. We are pleased to know that you found our paper interesting and recognized the thoroughness of our methods and discussion of results.

Regarding the language quality you mentioned, we will carefully revise it to ensure that the paper is more fluent and clear in language expression. We will re-examine the entire text and carefully proofread and improve possible language details.

Finally, we thank you again for your valuable comments and suggestions. We look forward to submitting the improved manuscript to you for your final approval.

Sincerely,

Zhuokai Li

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: TACE is considered the main non-surgical treatment option for hepatocellular carcinoma. Studies have pointed out that. In patients with intermediate-stage liver cancer, TACE therapy after palliative surgery could theoretically further reduce the blood supply to the tumour, thereby controlling or eliminating lesions that were not detected or resected during surgery. In this study, the authors validate the prophylactic role of TACE after resection of hepatocellular carcinoma and to assess its impact on patient prognosis. This study is well designed and performed. The findings are very interesting. Comments:

1. The manuscript is well written. However, a minor editing is required. Some minor language polishing should be revised.

Re: Thanks for your advice, we have polished the manuscript according to your suggestions.

2. Discussion is too long, please short it.

Re: We refined the discussion.

3. The tables should be double checked.

Re: We checked the table and found that there was an wrong description in Table 2. We deleted the words to the percentage symbol. Furthermore, we included ^a to mark the variability in statistical values.

Dear Reviewer #2,

First, we would like to thank you for your careful review and constructive comments on our study. We are pleased to hear that you thought the design and execution of our study was excellent and that you expressed interest in our findings.

In response to your specific suggestions, we have the following response:

Regarding language quality, we have carefully polished the full text according to your guidance to ensure that the article is more accurate and fluent in language expression.

You noted that the Discussion section was too long, and we have revisited and streamlined this section to ensure that the discussion is more focused and efficient while still comprehensively presenting our findings and implications.

We have carefully reviewed the form issues you mentioned. Particularly in Table 2, we found and corrected descriptive errors and updated the variability markers for statistical values to ensure the accuracy and clarity of the data.

Thank you again for your valuable feedback. We look forward to your review of the revised manuscript and hope to receive your final approval.

Sincerely,

Zhuokai Li