**Response Editorial Requests – Aug 9, 2022 Comments**

Thank you kindly again for providing editorial comments to the manuscript. We appreciate the continued cooperation and effort spent for detail evaluation of the manuscript text. We find all the requested changes reasonable and have made the following changes described below.

**Editor Comments**

**E1:** Consider adapting the title to "Radiomics artificial intelligence modelling for prediction of local control for colorectal liver metastases treated with radiotherapy"

**Author Response:** We are agreeable to the suggested title and fit the suggestion appropriate.

**Changes to Manuscript:**

**E2:** L45: Remove " from Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center"

**Author Response:** This has been removed from L45

**Changes to Manuscript:**

**E3:** L46: "radiomics" - this applies throughout the text

**Author Response:**

**Changes to Manuscript:**

**E4:** "and the most"

**Author Response:**

**Changes to Manuscript:**

**E5:** \* Two times in the Introduction you are using phrases such as "the goal of this work" and "we aim to address" far before you are reaching your aims of the study paragraph (the last in the Introduction). Please rewrite the Introduction so that you first state the aims of your study at the very end. There is considerable room to make the flow towards this aims statement more 'consistent. The Introduction can probably also be shortened without loss of significant information

**Author Response:** We agree that there is premature mentioning of the objectives and the flow would improve having it strictly at the end of the introduction. We have made changes following this.

**Changes to Manuscript:**

**E3:** L83, 86-87: "five", "nine" and "six" - also adjust elsewhere in the text; small integers (without units) should be written out in letters

**Author Response:** Small integers under 10 are now writer out in letters.

**Changes to Manuscript:**

**E7:** L114-118: You should here describe your aim, not what you actually did

**Author Response:** This has been adjusted to described the aim and not the work done.

**Changes to Manuscript:**

**E8:** Several of the figures/tables are too large to work well on a journal page in the published paper. Please be more selective, and more the least essential information to the Supplementary materials. Prioritize using the figures/tables to present results, e.g. you are 'using' two figures already before you are in the Results section

**Author Response:**

**Changes to Manuscript:**

**E9:** L221-226: This belongs in the materials and method section of the paper

**Author Response:**

**Changes to Manuscript:**

**E10:** L227-230: Rewrite these sentences; they should describe the results, not simply state where results are presented. The text in the Results section IS the results, figures and tables are there to support and expand on the text.

**Author Response:**

**Changes to Manuscript:**

**E11:** Table 2 is too large

**Author Response:**

**Changes to Manuscript:**

**E12:** L229: There should not be a citation to Tables 4-6, as these do not exist. I assume you mean the third table here (that is named Table 4), and probably some of the supplementary tables?

**Author Response:**

**Changes to Manuscript:**

**E13:** L242: There should not be references in the Results text

**Author Response:**

**Changes to Manuscript:**

**E14:** The first paragraph of the Discussion should briefly describe the setting and key findings of the study, without references

**Author Response:**

**Changes to Manuscript:**

**E15:** The references in the Ref. list should be formatted STRICTLY according to our guidelines. E.g. no issue number, six authors listed before et al, use of correct short title of journals (e.g. ref 5)

**Author Response:**

**Changes to Manuscript:**

**E16:** The reference list contains a large number of quite old references. Consider if you can strengthen your paper by making it more up to date with respect to the literature you are citing and relating it to. E.g. in our journal, there are a number of recent papers that you could relate (compare/contrast to), for the continuity of our readers, such as Dinis Fernandes et al 2018 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33458399/>), Socarrás Fernández et al 2020 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33043157/>), Pfaehler et al 2021 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34816024/>) and others even more recent (in 2022) such as Saltybaeva, Brodin and Mbanu.

**Author Response:**

**Changes to Manuscript:**