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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

First of all, I’d like to thank the publisher and the authors for giving me the privilege of this review. I also congratulate the authors for presenting such a rare case of hepatoid gastric adenocarcinoma. 1-In the abstract, mention, what were the complications that the patient died of? 2-Why there was no trial of palliative resection, no notification about the patient’s general, nutritional status and fitness for anesthesia? 3-Why the other treatment modalities were not tried, e.g. palliative gastrectomy. 4-Do you have any role for MDT / tumor board discussion for organization of the proper plan for patient condition. 5-How about the patient’s nutritional status with such a big proximal gastric cancer, any role for feeding jejunostomy or naso-jejunal feeding tube or TPN? 6-The patient died of intestinal infection is not understood, what do you mean by this, which type of infection, when & where he was hospitalized, how did you guarantee that this was not a side effect of CTH? 7-Why you didn’t mention, how many cases were recorded in literature??
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Abstract:  - Add detailed data about the participants (diagnosis, BMI, recruitment, settings).  - Results without p-values do not provide noteworthy findings.  - The conclusion should be precise. Add the future directions.  

Introduction:  - This section cannot cover all the elements of the study.  - Define "Gastric hepatoid adenocarcinoma" in detail.  - Explain the measured variables.  - The significance of the study needs more details. 

Methods:  - The study design, ethics, and setting are not clear.  - How and who administretes the data collection?  - How did you achieve the validity and reliability of the outcome measures?  - For statistical analysis, explain all methods used in detail and add the software used.  - Please, re-frame the components (SPICES) for methods i. Study design, setting ii. Participant iii. Intervention/issue of interest (exposure) iv. Comparison v. Ethics and endpoint vi. Statistical analysis - What were the eligibility criteria?  - Mention the settings and locations where the data were collected.  - Provide sufficient details of the intervention.  

Results:  - Results need to provide answers to the questions raised/researchable problem - Results need to follow ABC (accuracy, brevity, clarity) - Kindly frame it along with the following elements of results i. Text to tell the story ii. Tables to summarize the evidence iii. Figures to highlight the main findings - Kindly provide dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up.  - This section needs to be put in the line with objectives.  - Explain Recruitment and Baseline data.  - Outcomes and estimation need to be explained well. Discussion - Add an introductory paragraph to explain the main findings based on the objectives and hypothesis of the study.  - Compare the findings with previous studies.  - Explain strengths and limitations in detail.  

- Add your recommendations and future directions. Conclusion:  - Add your
"brief message" for the readers and researchers.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
There are too many figures for a case report, please limit the figures to 2 or 3 (you can combine the figures as 1A, 1B, 1C etc) The case report highlights the potential treatment option for a rare type of liver cancer and resulted in the better prognosis, however the treatment proposed may not fit for all patients with GHA and needs further evaluation in a larger cohort or a randomized controlled trial.