SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**JournalofCancerandTumorInternational**
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**

GeneralguidelineforPeerReviewprocess:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lackofNovelty'**, 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)*
Compulsory 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.	
Minor 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?	

	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.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Maria Filomena Botelho***
Department, University & Country	***University of Coimbra, Portugal***