

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 89055

Title: Sorafenib plus transarterial chemoembolization vs sorafenib alone for patients with advanced hepatocellular carcinoma: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03912378

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BSc, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Australia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-10-20 23:38

Reviewer performed review: 2023-10-27 01:15

Review time: 6 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The number of patients stated, 2780, is the maximum number, but was fewer for most of the parameters. Statistical analysis results of each parameter are provided with p value, but n [number of patients in that analysis] should be added every place that the data is written; in abstract, results and discussion. The reason is that each parameter has a different n, because the number of publications that provided such data is variable. Information about which studies included which parameters is in figures 2 and 3, but it should be made more explicit and obvious by provision of n each time.