Our response to the first reviewer:

We would like to thank the reviewer for the time spent reviewing our work and for the valuable and thorough feedback. Below we provide our responses to the reviewer's comments in a point-by-point manner:

i. This paper introduces an extensive survey of AI- and 3D Printing-based applications in context of Hepatocellular Carcinoma and Computer-aided solutions, an important field of study that embraces different Computer-Based Solutions such as Artificial Intelligent tools, 3D printing systems, and other innovative technologies to fight against liver cancer. The authors did a lot of work to gather, organize and discuss the state-of-the-art papers as well as recent works covering AI, ML and other trends in computer-generated image applications: **Our response:** we would like to thank the reviewer for the kind comments

ii. Despite the good analyzes and review process, I believe that the Discussion section could be conducted under the analysis of some main/pivotal works, as mentioned in the previous sections. By doing this, readers could have an interesting comparison involving the pros and cons of the current works / methodologies / systems. **Our response:** we would like to thank the reviewer for this insightful comment. Per the reviewer's comment, we have elaborated on the opportunities that arise from applying 3D printing, bioprinting, and AI/ML models in the Discussion section. The reviewer can find several additional paragraphs in the Discussion section. Per the reviewer's comments, these paragraphs discuss the main/pivotal works regarding the opportunities

that arise from the application of these technologies in the management of HCC. To increase readability and provide a link with the previous sections, we cite the related literature regarding each opportunity. Following these changes, sections 3.3. and 4.5 were removed from the main text since the information included is now included (though elaborated) in the Discussion section.

iii. Minor correction: "Cochrane, and Scopus databases was conducted using the following algorithms" => "Cochrane, and Scopus databases was conducted using the following queries" **Our response:** we would like to thank the reviewer for drawing our attention to this error. Per the reviewer's comment, we have revised the sentence accordingly. **The sentence now reads:** "A comprehensive literature review of the Medline, Cochrane, and Scopus databases was conducted using the following algorithms or queries:"