

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

**Manuscript NO:** 82520

**Title:** Pain management in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma after transcatheter arterial chemoembolisation: A retrospective study

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02731847

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Staff Physician

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Brazil

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-12-21 13:32

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-12-23 18:21

**Review time:** 2 Days and 4 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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

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**

This is a very interesting paper, using ML to predict an outcome, with consistent results.  
I recommend acceptance.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

**Manuscript NO:** 82520

**Title:** Pain management in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma after transcatheter arterial chemoembolisation: A retrospective study

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03724988

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-12-21 08:57

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-01-01 18:43

**Review time:** 11 Days and 9 Hours

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 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

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

I read this paper about the prediction of post-operative pain in TACE with interest. The Authors used an artificial intelligence application to develop a model able to predict the occurrence of severe pain after TACE. Despite the use of IA, the topic is not entirely novel. On the other hand, the authors provided a validation cohort, which is a strenght of this study. I have some concerns: 1) General comment: Even if the authors provided an English language certificate, many obvious errors are still fount throghout the text (for instance "mid-term" HCC instead of "intermediate", "TACE surgery", etc). I suggest to perform a further language revision; 2) Study population: I fail to see how a prospective population from the same hospital which enorlled the patients in a the retrospective phase can be considered an "external time-space validation". Time maybe, but not space. 3) Study population: it is not clear how the January 2020 deadline was chosen. Was this a prospective/retrospective study which was approved by the IRB on that date? Please clarify. How could the patients enrolled in the retrospective cohort provide an informed consent, considering that many of the were probaby dead at the time of the study? Finally, please provide an English translation of the IRB approval. 4)

Methods: please integrate your information by creating a paragraph titled "Pain mangement", in which the pain-management protocol is described (please report whether the patients received corticosteorids as part of the protocol and whether the pain-management protocols changed between 2016 and 2022) 5) Discussion, Line 282: embolization of nodules close to the gallbladder might also be an alternative cuase of pain, especially if cystic artery vessels provided bllood to the nodules and had to be embolized. 6) Discussion, Line 324: the whole discussion about coagulation is not convincing nor supported by referenced literature. Plesase find some reference to support these statement or tone down this hypothesis.