



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 37831

Title: Effect and safety of sorafenib in patients with intermediate hepatocellular carcinoma who received TACE: A retrospective cohort study

Reviewer's code: 00183339

Reviewer's country: Iran

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-01-13

Date reviewed: 2018-01-16

Review time: 2 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 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

This paper investigated Effect and safety of sorafenib in patients with intermediate hepatocellular carcinoma who received TACE. The manuscript is well presented and of interest. The study was done well and their results can contribute to knowledge of this topic.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 37831

Title: Effect and safety of sorafenib in patients with intermediate hepatocellular carcinoma who received TACE: A retrospective cohort study

Reviewer's code: 03537089

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-01-13

Date reviewed: 2018-01-20

Review time: 7 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 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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 study needs minor revision see the revised article



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 37831

Title: Effect and safety of sorafenib in patients with intermediate hepatocellular carcinoma who received TACE: A retrospective cohort study

Reviewer’s code: 00742121

Reviewer’s country: Greece

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-01-13

Date reviewed: 2018-01-27

Review time: 14 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

This is an interesting, well-written study, regarding the efficacy and safety of sorafenib in hepatocellular cancer. The main weakness is retrospective study design; certainly a prospective randomized trial would be preferable and this issue should be discussed in the Discussion section of the main text. However, since data regarding the administration of sorafenib in this clinical setting is scarce, the present paper should be accepted for publication after minor revision according to the following comments. - Cohort studies should be prospective. Hence, the last part of the title should be changed: “A retrospective cohort study” should be changed to “A retrospective comparative study”. - Abstract, Background, line 1: HCC is not “the most common and malignant cancer in the world”; please rephrase. - Abstract, Results, line 1: It is really questionable whether the authors should use only “median overall survival” or other measures of



**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

survival as well (e.g. overall survival rate). This comment also applies to the “Results” section of the main text. - Abstract, Conclusion, lines 2-4: The sentence beginning with “To achieve a better...” is not a conclusion. Hence, it should be either removed or rephrased. - Introduction, 1st paragraph: The epidemiological data provided in this paragraph are in part inaccurate and thus misleading: HCC is the 5th most common cancer and the 2nd cause of cancer-related mortality worldwide but only in men; in women it is only 9th and 6th, respectively. Furthermore, the authors should add some more information regarding geographical variations of HCC around the world (see: Torre LA, Bray F, Siegel RL, Ferlay J, Lortet-Tieulent J, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics, 2012. *CA Cancer J Clin.* 2015;65:87-108). - Page 3, line 15: This study is a retrospective comparative study, not a systematic review; the term systematic review refers to secondary analyses of published studies. - Page 4, line 14: “treated as” should be changed to “were included in”. - Page 4, line 15: “were treated as” should be changed to “were included in”. - Page 7, last paragraph entitled “Treatment responses”: This paragraph should be re-written in order to make comparisons of treatment responses between the two groups of patients more visible: CR of one group vs. CR of the other, PR of one group vs. PR of the other etc. - Page 10. Line 2: The acronyms ORR and DCR should be written in full. - Page 10: As mentioned earlier, the authors should discuss the main weakness, i.e. retrospective study design, as well as the strengths of the study, preferably just before the last paragraph, which presents the main conclusions of the study.