PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 61618

Title: Oncogenic TUFT1 As A Potential Molecular-targeted For Inhibiting Hepatocellular Carcinoma Growth

Reviewer's code: 02943115

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-14 11:00

Reviewer performed review: 2020-12-14 11:34

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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

1. In abstract section and core tip section, authors should describe the brief comment on the function of Tuftelin1 (TUFT1), such as, "It has been reported that Tuftelin1 (TUFT1) are regulated by hypoxia and involved in the Hedgehog signaling pathway." 2. Insert space between 15.8 and y, like, "…the patients were 111 males and 21 females with 21 ~ 79 years old (average 60.04±15.8 y)." 3. Please make a correction from "Inhibiting TUFT1 plasmid" to "Plasmid coding short hairpin RNA against TUFT1". 4. Why did the authors choose MHCC-97H and Hep3B cells for transfection? Authors should explain the reasons clearly.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 61618

Title: Oncogenic TUFT1 As A Potential Molecular-targeted For Inhibiting Hepatocellular Carcinoma Growth

Reviewer's code: 00036801

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-14 18:30

Reviewer performed review: 2020-12-21 20:07

Review time: 7 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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 [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] 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 is an interesting manuscript about the oncogenic role of TUFT1 in HCC. Experiments are well design and performed and results are properly described. However, there are several points that authors must clarify to achieve a clearer and more precise message for readers. These points are: 1) Authors must describe in detail the method used to calculate the staining intensities and the rates of positive cells in the immunohistochemistry (count of cells, software used to calculate intensity, …) 2) Immunohistochemistry analysis was performed by two blinded independent pathologists. Results of statistical analysis of the agreement between observers must be described in the manuscript. 3) Overall survival and disease-free survival must be defined in the methods section. 4) In statistical analysis section - the statistical tests that have been used in the univariate and multivariate analyses remain to be detailed 5) According to table 2 data, high TUFT1 expression is associated to absence of vascular invasion and ascites. This is in disagreement with the sentence "The level of high TUFT1 was associated with tumor size, vascular invasion, HBeAg, advanced TNM stage of HCC, and ascites of patients" (page 7). 6) It should be indicated at the bottom of the figures if the data are means or medians, standard deviation or standard error or interquartile range. It should also be indicated if a correction for multiple comparisons has been considered in comparisons between more than two groups. 7) What statistical test was used in the table 1 to compare the TUFT1 score? 8) HR values on table 3 are in disagreement with the order of categories in the column Group. For example, tumor size categories are indicated as <3 vs. >3 and HR = 3.680 indicating that the risk is higher in the category <3. All the table should be revised. 9) It must be indicated at the bottom of the figure 3 the number of patients at risk by time 10) The last paragraph of result section is a speculation that is not supported by data in the manuscript. The speculation is based

on genes and other components missing in this study. It would be better a simpler diagram mainly based in data obtained in this work.   11) English needs to be revised. There are both misspelled terms ("antigen retrievalling", "HCC tissuess", "Univarite analysis", "flod-change" and more) and phrases with inappropriate syntax.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 61618

Title: Oncogenic TUFT1 As A Potential Molecular-targeted For Inhibiting Hepatocellular Carcinoma Growth

Reviewer's code: 00036801

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-14

Reviewer chosen by: Le Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-07 08:00

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-08 10:39

Review time: 1 Day and 2 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) [Y] Minor revision　　[　] Major revision　　[　] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous　　[　] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [　] Yes　　[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors have answered correctly to most comments except the comment about the agreement between observers (I didn't found this data in the revised manuscript).