

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 19063

**Title:** New Advances in Hepatocellular Carcinoma

**Reviewer's code:** 00926880

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-05-07 13:57

**Date reviewed:** 2015-07-28 13:39

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a review article on New Advances in Hepatocellular Carcinoma. My comments are: (1) This is not a systematic review. This review contains a lot of personal views and biases of the authors. (2) The review is very long. This review article is more like a book chapter than a review article. (3) The article has many typographical and grammatical mistakes. Occasionally non-English terms appeared in the article, e.g. metanalysis, yuxtahiliar, hipoxia-induced, Ooccasionally. (4) There is no need to include the figures into this review. (5) The references (Bibliografia) is not in a single format, e.g. (a) reference 1 has 3 authors followed by et al., reference 9 has 6 authors followed by et al; (b) reference 4, pages 745-750, reference 155, pages 311-22, in many other references the last page was not given; (c) reference 125 is a duplication of reference 109.

- 1) We have tried to give an objective view, eliminating personal views.
- 2) We have tried to simplify the review.
- 3) Corrected spelling and grammatical errors.
- 4) We believe that the figures contribute to enriching the review.
- 5) The references have been corrected according to the rules. Thank you for your contribution.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 19063

**Title:** New Advances in Hepatocellular Carcinoma

**Reviewer's code:** 02537213

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-05-07 13:57

**Date reviewed:** 2015-07-30 16:10

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. This is a comprehensive review of the new advances in HCC. The comments is positive except for minor language problems. 2. The tables was not standardized. 3. The figures didn't have arrows to point the lesions. The figure legends should meet the requirements. 4. Some of the references didn't meet the required formats. 5. Any acknowledgment? Such as funding support.

- We have taken into account feedback to correct and improve this review. Thank you for your contribution.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 19063

**Title:** New Advances in Hepatocellular Carcinoma

**Reviewer's code:** 00009760

**Reviewer's country:** Australia

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-05-07 13:57

**Date reviewed:** 2015-08-04 09:13

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an excellent review paper on HCC. There are many errors of English which must be changed.

- We have taken into account feedback to correct and improve this review. Thank you for your contribution.