

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 65350

Title: Why is there no effective Hepatitis C Virus vaccine yet?

Reviewer's code: 04417620

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Postdoc

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Pakistan

Author's Country/Territory: Uruguay

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-05 05:24

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-06 20:04

Review time: 1 Day and 14 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review article entitled "In the era of rapid mRNA-based vaccines: Why is there no effective Hepatitis C Virus vaccine yet?" is very interesting, extensive effort and can be accepted for publication after incorporating one minor suggestion. Discussion on the role of computational vaccine design strategies to design a highly conserved and effective HCV vaccine candidate will improve the manuscript.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 65350

Title: Why is there no effective Hepatitis C Virus vaccine yet?

Reviewer's code: 03475479

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Uruguay

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-04 22:51

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-07 13:28

Review time: 2 Days and 14 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors reviewed challenges about anti-HCV vaccine and discussed future possibilities to apply the vaccine. This article was well-addressed and well-written. But, as authors mentioned, DAAs for HCV has been developed and widely used. Vaccines in less-endemic status has smaller values for effective protection. Authors should also discuss economic significance in HCV vaccine.