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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study, Wang et al. investigated tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes in HCC from patients who underwent hemi-hepatectomy. Overall, the study was presented and provided some clinically relevant study results. Some minors were suggested to enhance the quality of the manuscript. 1. In Figure 1, some letters were covered by the border line. 2. Table 3 was suggested to integrate into Figure 2 legend, at least, Figure 2 legend should be mentioned the different color shown in Table 3. 3. In addition, some other minors: Correct 3% H2O2 to 3% H2O2 (Subscript); and (3) FLR/SLV > and (3) FLR/SLV; expressed as quantity (%). > expressed as quantity (%); 36.9% (21.6% ~ 45.4%) > 36.9% (21.6% ~ 45.4%), as well as ~ in all the Tables. Abbreviations such as alpha-fetoprotein (AFP) showed twice in the manuscript. Using journal style for the words and references in the manuscript.
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1 Title. The title reflects the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript  

2 Abstract. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript.  

3 Key words. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript  

4 Background. The authors provided a concise summary of the current evidence  

5 Methods. The methods section and especially the SAP part requires further attention and polishing  

6 Results. The results section is appropriately written  

7 Discussion. The discussion part successfully elaborates on the study findings and the current knowledge on the topic  

8 Illustrations and tables. The quality of the figures and tables is satisfactory.  

9 Biostatistics. The authors did not provide a formal biostatistical certificate. Moreover, several issues regarding their statistical analysis plan should be clarified, such as:  

- normality test results should be provided as supplementary data  
- PSM module approach should be further clarified  

10 Units. The manuscript does meet the requirements of use of SI units  

11 References. The references adhere to the journal principles  

12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. The overall quality of the manuscript is low  

13 Research methods and reporting. The manuscript does not report adherence to specific reporting guidelines  

14 Ethics statements. The informed consent template was not provided by the authors  

Specific comments to the authors:  

- The manuscript needs an extensive review by an English native speaker.  
- Please provide data regarding perioperative KI therapy