PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

Manuscript NO: 70592

Title: MicroRNAs as prognostic biomarkers for survival outcome in osteosarcoma: A meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03818597

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2021-08-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-08-07 16:49

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-09 15:41

Review time: 1 Day and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript is interesting work about evaluating the role of MicroRNA's as biomarker for osteosarcoma; I have several concern that should be addressed before publication as fellow: - Title is can be more informative and interesting.   - In abstract, methods, results, and conclusion was not appropriate; please describe with more details.   - Core tip is missing.   - Please specified the limitations of this study in the last paragraph of the discussion.   - please revised the conclusion to cover your findings.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

Manuscript NO: 70592

Title: MicroRNAs as prognostic biomarkers for survival outcome in osteosarcoma: A meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03455028

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2021-08-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-08-08 09:32

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-12 12:53

Review time: 4 Days and 3 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
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript, Gao et al. analyzed microRNAs' prognostic function in patients with osteosarcoma by searching several databases like PubMed, EMBASE, Web of Science and so on. This article strictly followed the steps of meta-analysis. Moreover, authors conducted subgroup analyses of the relationship between miRNA expression and OS to identify potential sources of heterogeneity. Finally, authors concluded that the high expression level of miRNA had a higher risk of poor prognosis of osteosarcoma. However, there are still several points they should revise as follows: 1. This paper lacks innovation. Similar meta-analysis has been published and there is no more original and deeper analysis seen in your article. Focusing on a specific microRNA to analyze its function in patients with osteosarcoma might be better.   2. In "Materials and Methods" → "Literature Search strategy": "osteosarcoma" or "osteosarcoma tumor" and "microRNA" or"miRNA" or "miR" and "prognosis" or "prognostic" or "survival" or "outcome" should been modified to ("osteosarcoma" or "osteosarcoma tumor") and ("microRNA" or"miRNA" or "miR") and ("prognosis" or "prognostic" or "survival" or "outcome").   3. Forest plots should be more clear and beautiful. The gray parts in forest plots should be deleted, or modify them to be more beautiful.   4. In Discussion, authors only analyzed the relationship between the expression of miRNA and the prognosis of patients with osteosarcoma in a superficial level. Which and how miRNAs affect the prognosis of patients with osteosarcoma should be further analyzed.