



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 26921

**Title:** Adjuvant sorafenib in hepatocellular carcinoma: A cautionary comment of STORM trial

**Reviewer's code:** 01560036

**Reviewer's country:** Russia

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-05-04 13:54

**Date reviewed:** 2016-05-04 18:43

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 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"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

nice editorial, clear and convincing. One orthographic error: "trialinvolving" - page 4, line 3 at the bottom



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243  
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 26921

**Title:** Adjuvant sorafenib in hepatocellular carcinoma: A cautionary comment of STORM trial

**Reviewer's code:** 03474696

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-05-04 13:54

**Date reviewed:** 2016-05-16 08:07

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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript, Zhong JH et al. described sorafenib therapy as adjuvant treatment in hepatocellular carcinoma patients. There are several problems to be corrected. 1. Please rewrite the Author contributions. Authors wrote that "Zhong JH and Du XK designed the study" and "Zhong JH, Wang YY, Gong WF, Ma L, Xiang BD, and Li LQ analyzed the data". This manuscript is not an original article. These expressions are regarded to be incorrect. Where is the analyzed data in this article? 2. The context from the 2nd to 3rd paragraphs would not be so good. In the 2nd paragraph, authors introduced a trial in which sorafenib was administrated after surgery. The next paragraph, they were to demonstrate the opposite results of other trials. However, they described here the trial in which sorafenib was used as adjuvant after TACE, which disturbed the context. Instead, discussing the results of STORM here would lead to the better understanding by readers. In addition, thinking of adjuvant therapy after surgery, STORM trial is very important one. Therefore, the name of Phase III trial "STORM" should be added in the main body.



**ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 26921

**Title:** Adjuvant sorafenib in hepatocellular carcinoma: A cautionary comment of STORM trial

**Reviewer’s code:** 02860871

**Reviewer’s country:** Netherlands

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-05-04 13:54

**Date reviewed:** 2016-06-07 14:27

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This editorial entitled “Adjuvant sorafenib in hepatocellular carcinoma: do we go right?” was well written and interesting in its field although the conclusion might be a bit exaggerated. The authors want to assess questions about the value of sorafenib for patients with hepatocellular carcinoma after surgery. Here some comments :

1. Up til now the only tumor-directed palliative option for HCC is sorafenib, an oral multi kinase inhibitor. The title made indicates that we need to review again the use of sorafenib. In this case, the discussion about any other option replacing sorafenib should be also included in the text, otherwise the title should be adjusted accordingly.
2. There are some parameters to assess whether a drug has a good efficacy in treatment response, such as survival, time to progression, disease free survival, adverse reaction, risk of recurrence, efficacy against metastasis, etc. It would be better if author summarizes from all the references and clinical trials based on those parameters and therefore the efficacy of sorafenib can be assess more objective both in positive and negative results.
3. It is best to provide all the clinical trials or study in one table mentioning its positive or negative result.
4. The author mentioned in page 5 that sorafenib may worsen outcomes in



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

certain patients. However it was not suitable with the reference provided (ref 3) in which a study by Bruix J (J Hepatol. 2012 Oct;57(4):821-9) mentioned that from their exploratory subgroup analyses showed that sorafenib consistently improved median OS and DCR compared with placebo in patients with advanced HCC, irrespective of disease etiology, baseline tumor burden, performance status, tumor stage, and prior therapy. And from reference 9, although the conclusion made stating that sorafenib is not an effective intervention in the adjuvant setting for HCC, we can see inside the article that the disease progression by sorafenib is better than placebo (recurrence for sorafenib /placebo : 170/279). 5. In the last paragraph, both clinical trials NCT00908752, NCT01009801 were terminated, therefore it is not wise to make conclusion based on these study.