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Reviewer's report:

Rong Cai and co-workers assessed the clinical meaningful question whether TACE alone or in combination with sorafenib can improve the outcome of patients with advanced HCC. The data were presented as meta-analysis.

Comments:

1. The authors should provide more information about the inclusion criteria. Which TACE protocol was used. Were there any differences in between the included studies for both mono- and combination therapy. Same for sorafenib. Dosage and duration of treatment should be provided for each study. Why including patients which refused surgical treatment? They might represent a better prognosis?

The combination of TACE and sorafenib was used in a simultaneous or sequential setting?

2. Almost all studies included in these meta-analysis were performed in asia. This should be addressed in the discussion.

3. I miss some studies, however, which should be discussed or included or addressed why not included: e.g. SPACE-Trial, Lencioni et al. 2016; Kudo et al. 2011

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

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