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**Reviewer's report:**

The paper has been carefully revised and has greatly improved, particularly with regards to the discussion section. Some minor revisions would be desirable

1) I would suggest the authors to substitute the last sentence of the conclusions in the abstract ("Decisions about TACE treatments should consider the risk of chronic deterioration in liver function even after a single TACE"), with the last sentence reported in the conclusions of the manuscript ("the present findings highlight the need for the careful selection of patients for TACE is important to help optimize the benefit of the overall HCC treatment course).

2) Although I understand the authors' point of view, I still believe that the TARE population should be deleted from the present study.

3) Regarding Table S2: are the reported median times calculated from the date of TACE? If so, it has to be noted that the median time to the last value of the so-called "chronic period" is little more than one month after TACE (35 days approximately) and very close to the worst data of the acute period. If this is the case, it should be underlined that this time interval cannot be considered representative of "long-term" or "chronic" deterioration of liver function. Please clearly report these data in the results and add a comment on this point in the discussion. How many patients had laboratory values reported at 3 months? Would it be possible to provide separate data for these patients?

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.  

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?  
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.  

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English  
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:  
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