## CORRECTION



## Correction to: Evaluation of treatment response in hepatocellular carcinoma in the explanted liver with Liver Imaging Reporting and Data System version 2017

Nieun Seo <sup>1</sup> • Myoung Soo Kim <sup>2</sup> • Mi-Suk Park <sup>1</sup> • Jin-Young Choi <sup>1</sup> • Richard K. G. Do <sup>3</sup> • Kyunghwa Han <sup>4</sup> • Myeong-Jin Kim <sup>1</sup>

Published online: 23 November 2020 © European Society of Radiology 2020

Correction to: European Radiology (2020) 30:261–271 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00330-019-06376-5

The original version of this article, published on 15 August 2019, unfortunately contained a mistake. The following correction has therefore been made in the original: The presentation of Table 3 was incorrect, the corrected table is given below. In addition, the incorrect values were cited in the third sentence of paragraph "Comparison of overall diagnostic performance to assess tumor viability: LI-RADS treatment response algorithm versus mRECIST." The sentence should read: "Both readers assigned equivocal category more frequently on CT rather than on MRI (10.3% vs. 6.0% in reader 1, and 8.4% vs. 4.8% in reader 2, respectively; Fig. 3)." The original article has been corrected.

The online version of the original article can be found at https://doi.org/10.1007/s00330-019-06376-5

- Mi-Suk Park radpms@yuhs.ac
- Department of Radiology, Severance Hospital, Yonsei University College of Medicine, 50 Yonsei-ro, Seodaemun-gu, Seoul 03722, South Korea
- Department of Surgery, Yonsei University College of Medicine, 50 Yonsei-ro, Seodaemun-gu, Seoul 03722, South Korea
- Department of Radiology, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, USA
- Department of Radiology, Research Institute of Radiological Science, Yonsei Biomedical Research Institute, 50 Yonsei-ro, Seodaemun-gu, Seoul 03722, South Korea



Eur Radiol (2021) 31:4400–4401 4401

 Table 3
 Distribution of LI-RADS category with CT and MRI

	CT $(n = 203)$		MRI (n = 84)	
	Pathologically viable ( $n = 120$ )	Pathologically nonviable ( $n = 83$ )	Pathologically viable $(n = 58)$	Pathologically nonviable ( $n = 26$ )
LR-TR viab	ole			
Reader 1	47 (39.2)	5 (6.0)	44 (75.9)	5 (19.2)
Reader 2	47 (39.2)	2 (2.4)	42 (72.4)	3 (11.5)
LR-TR equ	ivocal			
Reader 1	19 (15.8)	2 (2.4)	3 (3.6)	2 (7.7)
Reader 2	17 (14.2)	0 (0.0)	2 (3.4)	2 (7.7)
LR-TR non	viable			
Reader 1	54 (45.0)	76 (91.6)	11 (19.0)	19 (73.1)
Reader 2	56 (46.7)	81 (97.6)	14 (24.1)	21 (80.8)

Data in parentheses are percentages. Percentages may not sum to 100% because of rounding off

**Publisher's note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

