PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 88710

Title: Progress in the treatment of advanced hepatocellular carcinoma with immune combination therapy

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05424290

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBBS, MD

Professional title: Academic Research, Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-10-14 03:29

Reviewer performed review: 2023-10-24 07:31

Review time: 10 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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	[ ] 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	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] 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 have extensively reviewed the literature. I have few suggestions. 1. Authors have discussed almost all drugs. However, it would be desirable if they give comprehensive statements regarding what is actually approved and can be used in clinical practice at present. 2. The investigational drugs should be mentioned, however, at the end it should be clear that they await recommendations. 3. A flow chart algorithm can be included so that readers are benefitted.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 88710

Title: Progress in the treatment of advanced hepatocellular carcinoma with immune combination therapy

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03312470

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-06

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-24 05:40

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-01 09:51

Review time: 7 Days and 4 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) [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 MS presents numerous data describing treatment regimens for liver cancer. The presented data are relevant. The progress in HCC treatment is certainly noteworthy. My comments and suggestions. 1. The MS pays little attention to the comparison of different treatment approaches, their advantages and disadvantages. It is unclear which approaches the authors consider most promising. The "Summary and Outlook" section would be useful to expand the analytical information. 2. Tables 1 and 2 are of poor quality.