

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 65638

Title: Atezolizumab plus Bevacizumab versus Sorafenib or Atezolizumab alone for Unresectable Hepatocellular Carcinoma: Systematic Review

Reviewer's code: 01798570

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Full Professor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-12

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-16 18:38

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-18 12:10

Review time: 1 Day and 17 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Finding more than four studies could make the comparison more exclusive.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 65638

Title: Atezolizumab plus Bevacizumab versus Sorafenib or Atezolizumab alone for Unresectable Hepatocellular Carcinoma: Systematic Review

Reviewer's code: 03475142

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-12

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-15 10:54

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-24 09:46

Review time: 8 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript was reviewed for publication in the journal. The manuscript was designed to compare the efficacy and safety of combination immunogenic chemotherapy of atezolizumab and bevacizumab as first-line therapy as opposed to sorafenib and atezolizumab monotherapies, for patients with advanced HCC. The results obtained indicated that treatment of HCC with atezolizumab-bevacizumab is effective in improving survival in patients with unresectable HCC. It is the reviewer's opinion that the review is interesting and that the manuscript is easy to follow for the readers. However, it appears that there are a couple of concerns in the manuscript. 1) As the authors have discussed, this systematic review may be judged inadequate to provide strong recommendations due to the small number of included RCTs, two completed trials and two ongoing trials. This systematic review appears to be sort of premature. 2) The authors should emphasize the value of this review in more detail, compared to just reading the papers of two completed trials and two ongoing trials.