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Dear Dr. Scott Edmunds:

First of all, thank you for the interest in our manuscript. We have revised the manuscript with careful consideration of the reviews. The revised parts have been underlined in the manuscript. Below are our responses to the reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #1:
Question 1: The manuscript was revised, but still some issues remain. Major compulsory revisions. To the comment "Authors should explain why results obtained in Taiwanese subjects might be different of those obtained in other oriental populations, and specifically whether a different genetic background, diet or environmental factors or other risk factors for HCC are present in Taiwan but not in other regions. " authors argue that "Taiwanese are highly exposed to environmental carcinogens, hepatitis B virus (HBV) or hepatitis C virus (HCV) infection, and habitual alcohol and tobacco consumption [26, 29-31]. Not all references describe studies carried out in Taiwanese subjects. Authors should explain clearly what is different in Taiwanese subjects as compared to other Oriental subjects, regarding liver cancer risk. Is different the diet, or the exposure to environmental carcinogens or HBV or HCV, or smoking or drinking habits? The issue is important because it is important to know if this study is comparable to similar studies carried out in Oriental individuals.

Answer 1: Thank you. We have explained why the important in the obtainment of genetic impact of the phase II GSTs, GSTP1 and GSTA1, on the susceptibility to and clinico-pathological development of HCC among Taiwanese in this revised manuscript. Please see the first paragraph (line 1 to line 2; line 11 to line 14) and the 2nd paragraph (line 10 to line 23) in the section of background.
Reviewer # 2:

Question 1: We discussed referee 2’s comments with our board member and they felt regarding the problems matching the controls: "Whilst the matching could be better, what is not written in the manuscript is what these authors could do in their situation."

Answer 1: Thank you. Your suggestion is what we wanted to attain, nevertheless, this ideal was difficult to realize, however, we have illustrated the limitations and how we excluded selection bias as well as how we adjusted confounders for our study in the discussion section of this revised manuscript and we will do our best to perform this desirability in the future. Thank you very much.

Reviewer # 3:

Question 1: All the major and minor comments have incorporated and have-rewrites the suggested points by the authors. Samples size and statistical parts had also been done and it is ok.

Answer 1: Thank you.