



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Cancer and Tumor International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_22142
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy and Safety of Sorafenib in Patients with Advanced Hepatocellular Carcinoma
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Ethical Issues: The authors state that the study was approved by the local Ethical Committee but they don't present any other information.	Attached
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The paper analyses the effect of Sorafenib monotherapy in patients with advanced hepatocellular carcinoma. Besides being a fragile epidemiologic study due to do not have a control group neither be a double blind study, the results are interesting because the authors included patients in advanced status of the disease. Even though, the authors were able to recommend the treatment with the multikinase inhibitor evaluated. In my opinion, the paper can be accepted for publication but the authors should answer to some minor reviews, such as: The authors should be consistent between the text and what they presented in the tables. For example, related to toxicity the authors present the data on the table according to grade classification, however they discussed according to Child-Pugh score system. Also it is not clear what they want to reflect with the p values. The Child-Pugh scoring or grade scoring. Along all the text, the authors are not consistent with the acronyms. Also an example OAS and OS seems to represent the same thing or AFP and αFP. By other way there are acronyms that were never defined in the text. Figure 1 should have a legend. Line 75, we don't understand the value for platelet count. Is this value correct?	- Some changes of results had been done to overcome these points, hopping to be satisfactory. - All OS (overall survival) had corrected into OAS - Also, αFP (alpha-feto protein) had corrected into AFP - Legend of Figure 1 is written.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 76, gm/dl should be written as mg/dL. Line 78, gm/dl should be written as mg/dL. Line 78, dl should be written as dL. Line 82, the authors refer that a dynamic three-phase CT scan was performed. The authors should clarify to what organ or structure were evaluated. Related to the text, the English should be object of a major review.	- gm/dl is corrected into g/dL - The organ for dynamic three-phase CT scan had been clarified. - The English of the text was revised.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		