PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] 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

The authors investigate the gene expressions that may predict the hepatocellular carcinoma staging. The authors did a comprehensive analysis that contains DEGs (p-values, FDR, and Log Fold change), ROC, Go enrichment, KEGG pathway analysis and KM-plot. The manuscript is well-written. However, I have minor suggestions/concerns: - I checked the literature and it seems no-one else have analyze the hepatocellular carcinoma staging using DEGs. The author may stress this point. However, staging for other kind of cancer have been done. The author may highlight that in the introduction such as prostate (PMID: 30890858) and breast(PMID: 28561071). -The number of samples in each stage must be mentioned in the "1. Sample collection and screening" section. - If there is imbalance number of samples across the classes, how the authors dealt with. - for the folloiwng, which classes?? =>"However, our study also has many limitations. First, the sample size we selected was not large enough for specific analysis of subtypes in HCC". - 2-3 staements a out the significant of the finding from the bio/med side. how your paper could change the practice?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 86504

Title: Prognostic model of hepatocellular carcinoma based on cancer grade

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04232981

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-22

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-07-05 04:56

Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-05 19:20

Review time: 14 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major Comments: 1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript.   2. The results and discussion section is very weak and no emphasis is given on the discussion of the results like why certain effects are coming in to existence and what could be the possible reason behind them?   3. Conclusion: not properly written.   4. Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results.   5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature.   6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript.   7. English is modest. Therefore, the

authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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

Authors attempted well to answer one of the important research questions. However, there are several flaws (listed below) in the manuscript that need to be addressed prior to publication. 1. logFC greater than 2 and less than -2 be selected to detect DEGs.2. What is the novelty in this paper, is it method or result or something must be stated both in the abstract and discussion.3. Sometimes in the method, result and discussion part are hard to follow. Grammar and punctuation problems are almost everywhere. This makes it difficult to judge if the authors are using the correct way or not. Seems like the authors are in a hurry and not caring about these important points. Authors must take help of native speakers and work in the same field to polish the language of the manuscript Manuscript may be accepted if the above modification is done.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 86504

Title: Prognostic model of hepatocellular carcinoma based on cancer grade

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04232981

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-22

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-03 14:12

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-03 14:13

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] 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: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results.