PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 81112

Title: Correction: Propensity-matched analysis of patients with intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma or mixed hepatocellular-cholangiocarcinoma and hepatocellular carcinoma undergoing a liver transplant

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05923889

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Consultant Physician-Scientist, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-26 14:36

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-26 15:26

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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

Thanks for the opportunity to review the Correction "Propensity-matched analysis of patients with intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma or mixed hepatocellular-cholangiocarcinoma and hepatocellular carcinoma undergoing a liver transplant". The authors have revised figures 3 and 4 in their Supplementary Material. It should be accepted for publication in its present form.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 81112

Title: Correction: Propensity-matched analysis of patients with intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma or mixed hepatocellular-cholangiocarcinoma and hepatocellular carcinoma undergoing a liver transplant

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05455405

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-13 21:10

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-13 21:19

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] 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	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection

Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear editors! The authors have done work on correcting inaccuracies/errors of previously published data. The data in the figures and their captions are interesting and described in a concise scientific style. Successful further scientific work to the authors.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [Y] 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	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

the manuscript files are not correct. Please, attach the paper

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] 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) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have not properly addressed the issues and queries we raised. A linguistic revision should be performed by a professional service since there are some grammar mistakes and oversights. Discussion section: Very interesting and timely discussion. Of note, the authors should expand the Discussion section, including a more personal perspective to reflect on. For example, they could answer the following questions – in order to facilitate the understanding of this complex topic to readers: what potential does this study hold? What are the knowledge gaps and how do researchers tackle them? How do you see this area unfolding in the next 5 years? We think it would be extremely interesting for the readers.   Introduction section: the authors should expand and better discuss the evolving systemic treatment scenario and the molecular features of these tumors, and add some recently published papers regarding this topic (PMID: 32994319 ; PMID: 33645367; PMID: 32396398 ; PMID: 33592561)