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Reviewer's report:

The current study is a prospective cohort study "to investigate the prognostic value of GPS in patients with various stages of the disease and with different liver functional status".

- However, I was a bit confused as to how patients are allocated into curative treatment versus non-curative treatment groups. It seems like different criteria were applied to decide who should received which treatment.
- In addition, I could not find information with regards to how many patients were deemed "curative" and "non-curative" respectively.

The author showed reasonable review of current evidence.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
- Multiple statistical tests were used and the possibility of type I error increases significantly.
- In addition, the multivariate analysis did not specify which variables were entered to the analysis. This may mean the authors, for example, combined both mGPS and GPS in the analysis.
- I would suggest the editors or the authors to seek further statistical advice on whether there are any issues with the current analysis (I am afraid this is out of my area of expertise).

Are the data sound?
- The data did show mGPS and GPS (as well as other more conventional systems) are all prognostic.

Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
- Minor editorial changes are required when the manuscript is accepted.

Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
- Please comment on the limitations of the potential confounding relationships between liver function and inflammation. As progressive HCC patients would have poor liver function and reduced albumin, GPS in this group of patient is no
longer only a marker of inflammation but also a marker of poorer liver function. What implications do the authors think this will have to their results?
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**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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