

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78530

Title: Delineation of a SMARC -specific competing endogenous RNA network and its correlation with poor prognosis and immune cell infiltration in hepatocellular carcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05225141

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DVM, PhD

Professional title: N/A

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-02

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-02 16:01

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-05 12:12

Review time: 2 Days and 20 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study, the SMARCA4-specific competing endogenous RNA network and its correlation with poor prognosis and immune cell infiltration in HCC were analyzed. Overall, the analysis was well performed, and data were presented well except for data in Figure S2A. Some suggestions, The manuscript type, this manuscript looks like a meta-analysis but is not evidence-based medicine. Abbreviations should be listed in full names for the first time shown in the manuscript and the abstract. Take care of the space between words, such as cancer(Figure1); in Figure2; What is the major limitation of this study? This should be listed in the discussion part. Figure 1, listing cancer abbreviations in the legend. Figure 2, what is the number of cases in Figures 2A and 2B? Are they the same patients? Figure 4 legend, capitalize C of Correlation. Figure 5, what is the target of SMARCA4? Change the color of the two boxes in the transcription part. And what is the role of CA9? Listing the full name of CA9 in the legend. Replace Figure 2A. Amplify Figure S4.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78530

Title: Delineation of a SMARC -specific competing endogenous RNA network and its correlation with poor prognosis and immune cell infiltration in hepatocellular carcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04770380

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: DSc, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-02

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-10 14:51

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-19 13:17

Review time: 8 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Anonymous [<input type="checkbox"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="checkbox"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript entitled “Delineation of a SMARCA4-specific competing endogenous RNA network and its correlation with poor prognosis and immune cell infiltration in hepatocellular carcinoma” focuses on the investigation of lncRNA-miRNA-SMARCA4 axis involved in post-transcriptional regulation of immune infiltration during hepatocarcinogenesis. Additionally, the authors assessed the prognostic value of this axis in HCC. Major concerns: 1. The work was carried out with the use of differential gene expression and non-coding RNA expression analysis based on bioinformatics approaches. Therefore, a major concern is the absence of experimental confirmation of the results obtained in this work. 2. On my opinion, major results obtained in this work is prediction of lncRNA-miRNA-SMARCA4 axis. However, this was not reflected in the title and Abstract. Other concerns: 1. Title is somewhat long and does not contain main results obtained in this work. 2. Abstract: Methods subsection is vague; it should contain more detailed description of methods including prediction of lncRNAs and miRNAs. Results subsection should contain data on predicted interactions between miRNAs, lncRNAs, and SMARCA4. The same for Conclusion section. 3. Methods: Since miRNAs interact with genes and lncRNAs compete with genes, it is recommended to use the word “interact” instead “upstream”. The same for Results section. 4. Results: Subsection 3.1, as shown on Fig. 1, the SMARCA4 expression is elevated in some cancer types (GBM, KICH, etc.). However, the authors stated that “to be substantially higher than in normal in all 18 types of cancer”. Subsection 3.2 stated that “higher expression levels of SMARCA4 were correlated with poor prognosis in patients with HCC”, however, Fig. 2 shows that higher 2-year, 5-year, and 10-year patients’ OS at higher SMARCA4 levels is



**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

not obvious. 5. Abbreviations should be explained at their first usage.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78530

Title: Delineation of a SMARCC -specific competing endogenous RNA network and its correlation with poor prognosis and immune cell infiltration in hepatocellular carcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04770380

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: DSc, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-02

Reviewer chosen by: Li-Li Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-15 13:00

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-15 14:49

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have addressed most of my concerns and recommendations. Except the concern regarding the usage of the term “upstream” when describing the interrelations between mRNA and miRNA, miRNA and lncRNA. In the Ref. provided by the authors, there is no usage of the term “upstream”. Instead, Salmena et al. emphasized “we hypothesize that all types of RNA transcripts communicate through a new “language” mediated by microRNA binding sites”. This means that various RNA types communicate, i.e interact with each other. Indeed, from biochemical point of base pairing via. non-covalent interaction between nucleotides takes place. Please, correct this.