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Dear professor Furberg and other Editors-in-Chief,

Thank you very much for peer re-reviewing our manuscript, entitled ‘Transarterial RAdioembolisation versus ChemoEmbolisation for the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma (TRACE): study protocol for a randomised controlled trial’, for publication in TRIALS, article type ‘study protocol’.

The reviewer suggested a more consistent use of present/future tense in the methodology. We have implemented this suggestion and a more uniform pattern is now followed throughout the manuscript.

As requested we have attached a point by point reaction to the comments of the reviewer. All changes in the manuscript are highlighted by the use of ‘track changes’.

Thank you for considering the acceptance of our manuscript.

Sincerely, on behalf of all co-authors,

Maurice van den Bosch, MD, PhD
Professor of Radiology
University Medical Center Utrecht
Reaction to the comments of the reviewer:

**Reviewer's report:**

The protocol is generally well written. I have the following suggestions:

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

The language needs to be consistent. Some parts of methodology are in present tense and others are in future tense. A uniform pattern should be followed.

*Indeed there were some inconsistencies concerning the use of present/future tense. We have made the necessary adaptations: a more uniform pattern is now used throughout the manuscript (future tense is now consistently used in the methodology).*

**Minor Essential Revisions**

None.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published.

*Some language correction were made, highlighted by the use of ‘track changes’.*

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

No competing interests.

*Thank you very much for re-reviewing our manuscript.*