

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 53252

Title: Validation of the six-and-twelve Criteria among patients with hepatocellular carcinoma and performance score 1 receiving transarterial chemoembolization

Reviewer's code: 02353723

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Research Associate

Reviewer's country: Italy

Author's country: China

Manuscript submission date: 2019-12-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-12-13 08:18

Reviewer performed review: 2019-12-14 22:49

Review time: 1 Day and 14 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study of Wang et al. represents a valid attempt to scientifically support the use of TACE for patients with HCC and performance score 1. In general, the manuscript is well written, but the abstract needs some changes and the discussion should be extended at least mentioning some other possible therapeutical approaches. Specific comments

ABSTRACT 1. Change “trans-arterial” with transarterial, as reported in the remaining part of the manuscript. 2. Change “while numbers of patients ..” with while a large number of patients .. 3. In a retrospective study you do not “screen for eligibility” but “select” patients 4. In the materials and methods you mention for the first time the “6&12 Criteria” without any explanation. Move here the definition that you report in the results. 5. The C index also defined as “concordance statistic” (measure of goodness of fit for binary outcomes in a logistic regression model) is too specific to be mentioned in the abstract. Try to express the concept differently or omit it. 6. **CONCLUTION** should be **CONCLUSIONS** **THE CORE TIP** 1. “Current study retrospectively included ...” should be “The current study retrospectively included ..” **STUDY POPULATION** 1. Also in this case “ .. retrospectively screened for eligibility.” Should become “retrospectively selected” 2. How you obtained a written informed consent from all patients before treatment initiation if your study was retrospective? Retrospective studies that guarantee anonymity do not need informed consent. 3. Since a mixture of doxorubicin, cisplatin, epirubicin or oxaliplatin was selected according to the practice of each center, you should evaluate or at least make a comment in the discussion about the effect of the different cocktails on OS. **RESULTS** 1. Table 1 is a little bit confusing. Associate the legends “Number (%) / mean \pm S.D. / median [IQR], to each parameter/line instead of placing them on the top of the column. **DISCUSSION** A wider review of the literature and a comment on the possible alternative techniques such as



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

TARE, would make the discussion more complete (see Facciorusso et al. doi: 10.4254/wjh.v7.i16.2009)

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 53252

Title: Validation of the six-and-twelve Criteria among patients with hepatocellular carcinoma and performance score 1 receiving transarterial chemoembolization

Reviewer's code: 02936084

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Author's country: China

Manuscript submission date: 2019-12-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-12-14 22:44

Reviewer performed review: 2019-12-27 11:18

Review time: 12 Days and 12 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear colleagues Hallo, I hope you are fine. Manuscript titled " Validation of the Six-and-Twelve Criteria among patients with hepatocellular carcinoma and performance score 1 receiving trans-arterial chemoembolization" by Wang Z. - The authors have investigate treatment outcomes of TACE in HCC with ECOG score of 1 alone and propose a specific prognostic model -The idea is very good. The study is well-designed. The manuscript was well, concisely and coherently organized. I recommend to accept this article after reviewing the statistical methods.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No