

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 75071

Title: Differences of core genes in liver fibrosis and hepatocellular carcinoma: evidence from integrated bioinformatics and immunohistochemical analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05430684

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-25

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-07 16:40

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-07 19:06

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input type="checkbox"/>] Anonymous [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="checkbox"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Editor, I studied carefully the manuscript entitled "Differences of core genes in liver fibrosis and hepatocellular carcinoma: evidence from integrated bioinformatics and immunohistochemical analysis" by Yuan SL et al. This is an interesting work aiming to contribute to the relation between gene expression patterns and the degree of liver fibrosis and survival rates in HCC. The authors use an animal model to strengthen their results. Although this study has proposed a signal transduction pathway involved in liver cirrhosis and HCC, an in-depth analysis on the mechanism of action of the proteins involved lacks. However, the manuscript is well-written; the methodology is sound, and the statistical approach is accurate. The piece of information provided is of significant interest to the specialist and will further facilitate researchers of the field. As a matter of fact, the manuscript deserves publication.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 75071

Title: Differences of core genes in liver fibrosis and hepatocellular carcinoma: evidence from integrated bioinformatics and immunohistochemical analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05326451

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS

Professional title: Academic Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-25

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-02 19:12

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-12 03:59

Review time: 9 Days and 8 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="radio"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="radio"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="radio"/> Minor revision <input type="radio"/> Major revision <input type="radio"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> 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>

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an excellent manuscript, which includes bioinformatics in its methodology. It adds to the body of science greatly and presents a new way of looking at medical research. Authors make very accurate conclusions, with a great sense of the limitations. I have following comments: 1) Make abstract results more concise 2) Mention the limitations of bioinformatics also in discussion.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 75071

Title: Differences of core genes in liver fibrosis and hepatocellular carcinoma: evidence from integrated bioinformatics and immunohistochemical analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05346014

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-25

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-07 22:05

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-16 20:39

Review time: 8 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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 checked="" 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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Basic Study Differences of core genes in liver fibrosis and hepatocellular carcinoma: evidence from integrated bioinformatics and immunohistochemical analysis

Comments to the authors Thank you for allowing me to review your full-length article. The manuscript discussed a relevant topic on the field of hepatology. I would just like to raise some relevant points for further discussion which could possibly help to make the manuscript better.

MATERIALS AND METHODS: Patient liver samples collection “Patients who were tested positive for hepatitis B surface antigen, chronic hepatitis C, drug-induced liver disease, non-alcoholic liver disease, alcoholic liver disease, autoimmune liver disease, cholestatic liver disease, or hereditary metabolic liver disease were excluded”. Please, could the authors explain why patients who were tested positive for hepatitis B surface antigen? The authors included patients with CHB (n=28) and CHB-associated HCC (n=12). Chronic HBV infection is defined as persistence of HBsAg in serum for at least 6 months after acute infection. Clarification should be provided on this issue.

Statistical analysis Were the data distributed normally? The statistical analysis section is poor; please, the authors should describe this section with enough detail to enable readers to understand your results.

Results The Results Section and the material and methods section are conflated. Results should be reported in the Results Section and the methods should be previously explained in the Material and Methods Section. It is difficult to follow what the author(s) demonstrated in the tables. Authors should be more careful of tables details.

Reviewer conclusion: • Minor revision