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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The work by Magdy Fouad et al. retrospectively analyzed the differences in basic clinical, radiological and laboratory characteristics as well as tumor behavior upon HCC diagnosis between patients with and without a previous history of DAAs exposure. The authors reported that aggressive tumours were more common in DAAs exposed patients and anti-HCV therapy in HCC patients should be postponed until a consistent risk-benefit ratio is established through further research. This work is interesting and instructive. There are several questions should be addressed before acceptance.

1. The third paragraph in introduction is obscure. First, I could not retrieve the cited paper in Pubmed (ref 6); second, the author should have cited the paper by the Italian group. So, “This study included 344 patients with HCV-related cirrhosis who received different DAA regimens”, who conducted this study?

2. What is the final outcome (Overall survival, RFS) of these patients? Follow-up data are required.

3. The statement “group 1/I”, “group 2/II” should be consistent throughout the paper. There are several writing errors in this manuscript.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Dear authors  This is an important issue that has created doubts in the hepatology community. However, it is now recognized that the effect of higher rates of HCC after treatment with DAA could be related to treat worse patients that would never tolerate IFN-based therapies. Your study is very interesting as it presents different results, but there are some question that should be clarified: Why were patients from group II not treated with DAA? Were they treated with IFN-based therapies? Had they achieved SVR? Were there other cause-related deaths in group II? As they had more advanced liver disease they could not have time to develop HCC. In the case of your results, how would you explain higher rates of HCC with DAA treated patients?
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Manuscript overall is very good.... but the authors need to summarise the data into tables and the conclusion can be a little more elaborate.....add a note on limitations of the study