



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 80909

Title: Prognostic role of RFWD3 and immune cell infiltration in hepatocellular carcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06407385

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-31 03:09

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-07 08:33

Review time: 7 Days and 5 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Judgment by peer reviewers	Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation?



	<input type="checkbox"/> [J31] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J30] No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods? <input type="checkbox"/> [J41] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? <input type="checkbox"/> [J51] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? <input type="checkbox"/> [J61] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J60] No
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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
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

The authors appreciated the reported unique view in probing into the prognostic implication of RFWD3 in HCC. They explored the correlation between RFWD3 expression and infiltration level of 24 immune cells. However, I think the research is not innovative enough. And the author only used database data for analysis, and did not verify in patient samples.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 80909

Title: Prognostic role of RFWD3 and immune cell infiltration in hepatocellular carcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05267231

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Physician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-31 04:27

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-12 05:41

Review time: 12 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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
Judgment by peer reviewers	Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation?



	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [J31] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J30] No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [J41] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [J51] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [J61] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J60] No
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept (High priority) <input 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"/> [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Excellent work. It should be a full paper. Considering that half of the patients were classified as stage I (BCLC?), I wonder if RFWD3 expression differs among stages.