



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 57965

**Title:** A comparison between Hepatocellular Carcinoma Prognostic Scores: a 10-year Single-Center Experience and a Brief Review of the Current Literature

**Reviewer's code:** 02860797

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Research Fellow

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-06-30

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-07-04 11:04

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-07-19 11:45

**Review time:** 15 Days

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is an interesting study comparing the scoring systems of HCC. I have several comments: 1) The authors listed 17 scoring systems but why only two of them were compared? 2) Table 3 is too long too readable. 3) The authors demonstrated that excellent prognostic ability of the ITA.LI.CA if compared to BCLC. However, from the data I guess BCLC looks better than ITA.LI.CA. How could they make the judgement? 4) Some typos are found. Such as TABLE XXX.