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Reviewer's report:

In this study, authors have discovered that GLR (Gamma-glutamyl transpeptidase to lymphocyte count ratio) can be used as a predictive biomarker for Hepatocellular carcinoma with MVI. The novel results in this study are interesting and further expands our current understanding in this field. The lack of a biomarker to predict MVI in HCC patients before the surgical treatment is critical and having the potential value for GLR could be extremely useful for the patients in terms of personalized treatment. Overall, I think the authors have made exciting observations and I do see a potential in the present manuscript. Though, I would like to see the following concerns to be addressed.

The overall language of the manuscript is inadequate and causes difficulty to comprehend science. There are many spelling and grammar mistakes in the main body of the manuscript. I think taking help from a language editing service to improve the quality of English would be helpful. Particularly, the introduction and discussion section need to organized coherently and proofread thoroughly.

Authors should cite more references when stating a key scientific fact in the text for example introduction paragraph 1 line 14" liver cancer is a major public health problem facing the world. In addition to this, the references are missing and/or incorrectly cited in the manuscript.

How GLR estimation is a better biomarker for prediction of HCC with MVI than other known markers (if known any) needs to explain in more detail.

Progression-free survival (PFS) and overall survival (OS) are not clearly defined and make the data interpretation difficult. The authors should clearly describe the difference between PFS and OS in the text.

The sample size used in this study is fairly small and includes much fewer females in the MVI group. The authors should explain this limitation to the experiment. Additionally, did the authors calculate the cut-off GLR value for the non-MVI group? I think this is key information missing from the data analysis.

The figure legends for all three figures are poorly written which needs to be more descriptive. Legends should include the details for the type of analysis performed, statistical details, etc. The detailed figure legends help readers to understand the experimental approach and data interpretation clearly.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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