PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 51680

Title: Construction of a risk score prognosis model based on hepatocellular carcinoma microenvironment

Reviewer's code: 03259512

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MSc, PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Lecturer

Reviewer's country: Australia

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Artificial Intelligence Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-09-30 10:43

Reviewer performed review: 2019-10-06 00:58

Review time: 5 Days and 14 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[Y] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[Y] Advanced
			[ ] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study investigates the hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) microenvironment and identifies prognostic genes/gene signature for HCC. The study uses the data base analysis approach. Specifically, the Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) based analysis was used with ESTIMATE algorithm. The study is well written and comprehensive. However, few sections can be improved. The abstract is too generalized and does not indicate with genes/what gene signature was identified as the most important. I understand that it might be a long list of genes to list, however, several the most interesting genes/pathway (considering the inflammatory profile) should be shown (it is up to the author which genes to mention and explain why they are shown; this would increase the quality of the study and attract the interest to this paper). For instance , in discussion section it is written that "The genes (DAB2, MSC, CXCL8, LGALS3, BATF, KLRB1, ENG and APCS) that compose our risk score model could be considered to be potential targets, and they may provide better performance in combination". This can be used in the abstract. NOTUM, PAGE4, PEG10...etc-genes and signaling pathways were identified among the relevant to the prognosis. It might be also indicated in the abstract. Simplified schematic presentation of the analyzed associations could be also presented. The paper contains many figures, however several of them can be attached as Supplementary material. The simplified scheme of association between the top-related genes/pathway and the observed effect of inflammation/microenvironment are preferable.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 51680

Title: Construction of a risk score prognosis model based on hepatocellular carcinoma microenvironment

Reviewer's code: 04737441

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBChB, MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Lecturer, Senior Research Fellow

Reviewer's country: Germany

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Zhou Tang

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-10-25 19:40

Reviewer performed review: 2019-10-30 12:32

Review time: 4 Days and 16 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[Y] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

4

Actually, this study was performed at a good methodological level in a good number of patients. Indeed, the immune/stromal scores will help in guiding the immunotherapy in HCC patients. I would like to see how these scores would perform prospectively in guiding treatment algorithms but this would need a new prospective study. For now, may be out of spectrum but it would be interesting to see how these scores would perform in comparison to other established and novel scoring systems as BCLC, ALBI etc,. This could be even added to the supplemental materials. Besides, some typos need to be corrected and an overall language polishing is recommended. Otherwise, the authors did great effort in this study and I have no further comments.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No