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Reviewer's report:

Dear editor

The manuscript by Dr. Siriwardana entitled: "Factors affecting post embolization fever and liver failure after TACE in a cohort without a background of infective hepatitis-a prospective study", describes the outcomes of a small cohort of patients with NASH and ALD associated cirrhosis that underwent TACE for HCC. The study adds little to current knowledge, however the methodology is reasonable and the manuscript is well written and can be accepted pending corrections

Major comments:

1. The authors repeatedly state that his cohort is of NASH and ALD associated cirrhosis. It is unclear whether these are consecutive patients or selected patients. The authors should clarify this point. It would be interesting to compare complication rates of this cohort and a cohort with viral hepatitis

2. The study adds very little to current knowledge. Multiple larger and more rigorous studies were already published in the past.

3. In the definition of AHD there are 2 parameters that are subjective. I.e. encephalopathy and increased ascites. The authors should explain how these parameters were measured and determined. They should state the exact increase in encephalopathy New-Haven score and the amount of ascites that was considered deterioration.

4. Follow-up was done on days 1-3 post embolization; however the authors state that without early complications patients were discharged after 48 hours. This would suggest that delayed appearance of symptoms may have been missed.

5. Furthermore-the authors followed patients on day 7 at an out-patient clinic. The authors should describe whether there were any drop-outs and missed clinic visits

6. In any case the authors do not discuss the possibility of missing late complications. Hepatic abscesses can occur further then this short time follow-up.

7. The discussion is very repetitive with the entire first paragraph, re-stating the results. Furthermore the authors do not fully discuss the mechanisms that may be responsible for their results, and their narrative is purely descriptive.
Minor comments
1. There are multiple typos that need to be corrected
2. Page 12 line 259-a ref should be inserted

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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