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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Hepatic epithelioid hemangioendothelioma (HEHE) is a rare neoplasm of vascular origin. The rarity of HEHE in the general population significantly limits the possibilities of its study. After a comprehensive review of the literature performed in 2006 by A. Mehrabi et al. (DOI: 10.1002/cncr.22225) there are only single case reports in the literature. The authors tried to correct this shortcoming. They successfully conducted a meta-analysis of 96 previously published HEHE case reports, including a total of 184 patients as well as clinical data from two own patients. Interesting results were obtained. However, I strongly recommend that the authors to describe in detail the methods of statistical analysis as well as adding the analyzed literature sources to References.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for the opportunity to review this article, however, several concerns are raised to be addressed:

Abstract: - Please clarify the threshold of 0.05 set at two-tailed or one-tailed. - Please rephrase the conclusion instead of including short background and discussion.

Materials and Methods: - The description of methods is quite insufficient, particularly inclusion criteria subjects should be described in more details. - Did authors test whether the assumptions of Cox regression were met before applying it.

- The authors should depict more clearly the main model of adjustments for regression analysis.

Results: - I was wondering how authors deal with the extreme ages, i.e. 3 and 80? - Pregnantad is a typo? - What is the Table 1 names as “Reference” for ? - Ultivariate is a typo? - Please add abbreviations to Table 3.

Discussion: - Please add strengthen of your study.

- I would suggest authors to rephrase the logics of the discussion, mainly focus on 1-2 findings.
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