

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 80161

Title: Application of Ablative Therapy for Intrahepatic Recurrent Hepatocellular Carcinoma following Hepatectomy

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03739641

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Nurse, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-27 01:06

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-27 04:09

Review time: 3 Hours

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Scientific quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Judgment by peer reviewers | Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation? |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> [31] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [30] No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods? <input type="checkbox"/> [41] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? <input type="checkbox"/> [51] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? <input type="checkbox"/> [61] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [60] No |
| Language quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| Re-review | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

20220927 Reviewer on F6Publishing 1.You focused on ablation in treating RHCC. Why do you exclude surgical resections in treating RHCC? Surgery might be still effective in treating RHCC, which especially existing the limited intrahepatic area. You should add the negative aspects of hepatic surgeries in the introduction part more clearly. 2.You mentioned, “other available ablative techniques” in this article. It includes MWA, PEI, HIFU, CRA, and IRE. Those treatment options are not popular depending on the country, and fewer evidence that show clinical efficacy. You should make sure and revise these parts. 3.You also explained ablation combination therapy as an treatment option for RHCC. Those may not develop efficacy and safty by the phase III trials. You sould make sure these parts and revise better expansion. 4.Figure 1 is hard to understand if I look it as a hepatology expart. Because most part of the treatment

options are immature or have less evidences for efficacy and safety. You should make sure these parts and revise better explanation.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 80161

Title: Application of Ablative Therapy for Intrahepatic Recurrent Hepatocellular Carcinoma following Hepatectomy

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03316959

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-11 11:17

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-13 09:25

Review time: 1 Day and 22 Hours

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Scientific quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Judgment by peer reviewers | Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation? |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> [31] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [30] No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods? <input type="checkbox"/> [41] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? <input type="checkbox"/> [51] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? <input type="checkbox"/> [61] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [60] No |
| Language quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| Re-review | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors summarized the application of ablative therapy for intrahepatic recurrent hepatocellular carcinoma following hepatectomy. The paper is well written; however, the paper lacks a bold message. Here are the comments. Local ablation therapy can also be applied for treatment-naïve HCC. The authors did not emphasize enough why they focused on recurrent HCC. The authors can refer to specific post-operative conditions such as adhesion to the GI tract and skin operation scars. Second generation of MWA should be mentioned compared to previous version. Surgical resection for a recurrent HCC should be mentioned. The mechanism and literature of HIFU and IRE can be described in more detail since they are still not approved and available in most countries. Lastly, TKI and ICI should be mentioned for the treatment of HCC combined with local ablative therapy.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 80161

Title: Application of Ablative Therapy for Intrahepatic Recurrent Hepatocellular Carcinoma following Hepatectomy

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05348255

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-12 07:14

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-14 08:39

Review time: 2 Days and 1 Hour

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Scientific quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Judgment by peer reviewers | Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation? |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> [31] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [30] No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods? <input type="checkbox"/> [41] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? <input type="checkbox"/> [51] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? <input type="checkbox"/> [61] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [60] No |
| Language quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| Re-review | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript is interesting in revising this topic, however minor language editing is required. Additional adding some data about management of recurrent HCC with post surgical resection decompensation could be improve the quality of this manuscript based on the importance of liver decompensation post HCC resection.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 80161

Title: Application of Ablative Therapy for Intrahepatic Recurrent Hepatocellular Carcinoma following Hepatectomy

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06400385

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-11 06:00

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-17 08:34

Review time: 6 Days and 2 Hours

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Scientific quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Judgment by peer reviewers | Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation? |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> [J31] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J30] No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods? <input type="checkbox"/> [J41] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? <input type="checkbox"/> [J51] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? <input type="checkbox"/> [J61] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J60] No |
| Language quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| Re-review | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The purpose of this article is to review ablation for recurrent hepatocellular carcinoma. The authors have reviewed a great deal of literature and have written in much more detail. However, this article still has several problems that need to be addressed. 1. Many techniques or principles introduced in the article are not cited with references, and the authors should recheck the article in detail. 2. It is difficult for me to quickly understand the focus of the article based on the descriptions of multiple techniques and comparisons of different treatment options presented in the article. It would be helpful if the authors divided the article into several parts and summarized the key points in each part clearly and concisely. 3. The meaning of Figure 1 is not clear. Please explain each box's meaning and the picture's meaning, and add a legend. 4. Overall, this paper has not yet reached the requirements of publication and needs to be revised as a whole, such as the logic and



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

innovation of the article.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 80161

Title: Application of Ablative Therapy for Intrahepatic Recurrent Hepatocellular Carcinoma following Hepatectomy

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03476433

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, MSc

Professional title: Adjunct Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Colombia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-17 14:48

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-17 19:23

Review time: 4 Hours

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Scientific quality | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Judgment by peer reviewers | Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation? |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [31] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [30] No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [41] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [51] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [61] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [60] No |
| Language quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| Re-review | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read with interest the article by Rong Cong et al "Application of Ablative Therapy for Intrahepatic Recurrent Hepatocellular Carcinoma after Hepatectomy", in which the authors make a narrative review of this interesting topic. This is a very good review, with very good definitions, and includes many options for the management of recurrence of HCC after surgical resection. There are good explanations of various percutaneous options that address this common scenario in HCC. The order of the presentation, the main techniques and the references are very well presented.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 80161

Title: Application of Ablative Therapy for Intrahepatic Recurrent Hepatocellular Carcinoma following Hepatectomy

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03509976

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-11 08:01

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-20 07:05

Review time: 8 Days and 23 Hours

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Scientific quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Judgment by peer reviewers | Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation? |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [31] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [30] No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [41] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [51] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [61] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [60] No |
| Language quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| Re-review | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a well written article. A good summary of ablative techniques. But MWA is more widely used due to its advantages. You may write it in more detail. And comparative results of ablative techniques may be mentioned in article.