

Response to reviewers

Reviewer 1

The article is well written and only small language and typo corrections are needed.

The paper was revised by a professional editing service

"a perspective on the use of biomarkers (e.g. for Patient selection, bridging strategies and the immunologic Features associated with recurrence) would be very interesting and strengthen the paper (i.e. biomarkers beyond AFP and clinical Parameters like microvessel Invasion)"

Thanks for this suggestion. This issue has been included in the paper (see last 9 lines in the conclusion section).

Reviewer 2

"the statement: "Immunosuppressive regimens using inhibitors of mTOR can play a role in the prevention of recurrence after LT" is inaccurate as the own authors described in the manuscript a Phase III trial failed to show advantages (Evidence A). Please, delete or deeply modify this conclusion.

The sentence was rephrased according to the suggestion of the reviewer (see page 11, lines 11-13).

Table-2 is somewhat confusing. Please be explicit on the second column (Are these figures the rate of successful downstaging?.

The table was modified according to the suggestion of the reviewers. Results of the procedure and the corresponding reference (between commas) are now reported in column.

Des-gamma-carboxy prothrombin should replace dex-gamma-carboxi prothrobine

The phrase was corrected according to the suggestion of the reviewer (see page 4, third line from the bottom).

Centers should replace centres.

The word was replaced throughout the text according to the suggestion

All corrections have been marked in yellow in the main text.