

Response to Reviewer #1

We wish to express our appreciation to the reviewer for providing insightful comments on our paper. The comments have helped us significantly improve the paper.

1. *There are multiple spelling and syntax errors throughout the manuscript that must be addressed.*

We corrected them.

2. *The authors need to add arrows to Figure 2 and put a reference to that in the manuscript and figure legends to make their salient point more clear to the reader.*

We added the arrows and the arrowheads to Figure 2, and put a reference in the text and figure legends. (Page 5, Line 22-28; Page 5, Line 30-Page 6, Line 1)

Thank you again for your careful review of our manuscript. We look forward to receiving your further response.

Response to Reviewer #2

We wish to express our appreciation to the reviewer for providing insightful comments on our paper. The comments have helped us significantly improve the paper.

1. ... *However, poor pathologic differentiation of HCC is one of the risk factor for early local tumor recurrence. Therefore, authors should review about the pathologic differentiation of HCC response to RFA, too.*

We put a reference about the risk factors for local recurrence including the pathologic differentiation of HCC. (Page 3, Line 24-27)

Thank you again for your careful review of our manuscript. We look forward to receiving your further response.