

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 81639

Title: Radiomic advances in the transarterial chemoembolization (TACE)-related therapy for hepatocellular carcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04088126

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-05 23:40

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-18 04:34

Review time: 12 Days and 4 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 Grade E: Do not publish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="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors Thank you for your effort and time in writing such review - This topic is considered new and has many nomenclatures that have been mentioned without explanation or hint about it. - In order for anyone who is going to read such review article to understand this new topic, it should be written in simplified and illustrated manner. - Although this topic about radiomics, there is no single figure, image or illustration to show how it looks like, how it is designed. - The introduction was mainly about HCC and TACE and very short regarding radiomics. There should be a section to explain the basics of radiomics and the words used in this issue. - Page 5: HAP score, mHAP score, mHAP-II score, mHAP-III score and ALBI grade for arterial embolization of liver cancer. These abbreviations should be written complete first. - Page 6: The modified solid tumor response assessment criteria (mRECIST) Should be the modified Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 81639

Title: Radiomic advances in the transarterial chemoembolization (TACE)-related therapy for hepatocellular carcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 01557283

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-18

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-29 04:46

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-07 10:05

Review time: 9 Days and 5 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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

Summary of the manuscript. The present review seemed important to understand radiomics. However, the results of the manuscript cited were always very difficult to understand for non-experts. The authors should show the results of the papers concretely, and present easily understandably for non-experts. Major comments. Page 4. The authors documented the results reported by Kuang Y, et al [8]. The nomogram combined with radiomics and clinical model showed predictive potential for postoperative response to TACE. The authors should describe what responses were shown to be predictive by the nomogram. Page 5. The authors described about the report by Meng XP, et al [16]. The present article seems important. Therefore, the authors should describe their results very easily to understand. How was the radiomics important as a prognosticator? Page 6. The authors discussed about the report by Kong C, et al [19]. The authors summary of the manuscript also seemed difficult to understand the results. The authors should show the results easily understandable.