



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**Manuscript NO:** 36921

**Title:** The Epigenetic Basis of Hepatocellular Carcinoma: a Network-based Integrative Meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 00049991

**Reviewer's country:** Mexico

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2017-11-05

**Date reviewed:** 2017-11-06

**Review time:** 1 Day

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The Epigenetic Basis of Hepatocellular Carcinoma: a Network-based Integrative Metaanalysis Manuscript NO: 36921 1. The objective of this study that investigators wrote in the abstract section doesn't match with that in the end of the introduction section 2. What about the sample size and the incomplete information of the 11 database used? Any comment about that in the discussion section 3. Include the new 2017 AASLD guidelines on HCC in the references section 4. The supplementary material is not necessarily (table s1) or if you want to include it. You have to summarize.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**Manuscript NO:** 36921

**Title:** The Epigenetic Basis of Hepatocellular Carcinoma: a Network-based Integrative Meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 02539405

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2017-11-05

**Date reviewed:** 2017-11-08

**Review time:** 3 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Totally ,this Manuscript is good,while the overall structure of the manuscript is not complete(e.g Introduction, Conclusion),though maybe you have wrote about it,so I think you should arrange the structure again.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**Manuscript NO:** 36921

**Title:** The Epigenetic Basis of Hepatocellular Carcinoma: a Network-based Integrative Meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 00503849

**Reviewer's country:** Taiwan

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2017-11-05

**Date reviewed:** 2017-11-11

**Review time:** 5 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors performed an integrative network-based analysis approach of genome-wide DNA methylation data of both the promoter and body of genes. They identified G-protein coupled receptor signalling as the most highly associated with HCC. This finding was in consistent with previous literature on gene expression in HCC. Moreover, the authors also found few novel targetable genes such as HIST1H2AJ that are epigenetically modified, suggesting their potential as biomarkers and for therapeutic targeting of the HCC epigenome. Overall, this manuscript may provide useful data to support further study in HCC. However, the organization of the manuscript needs to be revised. Table 1 to 3 were embedded in the main text but there also had 2 tables labeled as Table 1 and 2 located after the section of the Discussion.