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Reviewer’s report:

Atkin and colleagues describe two cases of advanced hepatocellular carcinoma who have had remarkable responses to sorafenib therapy. Case reports have previously identified similar responses, although these are rare and seen mostly in HCV-related HCC. This is a well written and interesting case report with a good discussion. I have a few general and minor specific comments:

General Comments

- The performance status of both patients should be mentioned

- The choice for TACE as first-line therapy should be briefly explained for Case 1 as the patient has portal vein invasion. TACE has been used with good results in very selected patients with portal vein invasion, however the decision on its use varies from centre to centre

- During the initial post TACE period of tumour progression in Case 1, did the portal vein invasion extend?

- Did case 1 have any post-mortem histology available? If so, were any genetic studies carried out?

Specific Comments

Page 4

- line 40: please provide reference for 2 cases

Page 5

- line 41: ref 14 only needs to be at the end of this paragraph

- Line 53: suggest adding comma "In vitro, sorafenib,..."
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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