

## Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS

October 20, 2014



Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 13602-review.doc).

**Title:** Percutaneous Microwave ablation versus Radiofrequency ablation in the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma

**Author:** Loukia S Poulou, Evanthia Botsa, Ioanna Thanou, Panayiotis D Ziakas, Loukas Thanos

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 13602

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

1 Format has been updated

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer

In this review, Poulou et al. compare the advantages, disadvantages and therapeutic efficacy between Radiofrequency (RFA) and microwave ablation (MWA) for treatment of HCC.

(1) There are some spelling errors. For example, in the Abstract: Surgical rejection (line 2) -> resection.

**Answer:** We edited the manuscript and corrected spelling errors

(2) This manuscript might need English editing.

**Answer:** we performed English language "polishing" in the revised version.

(3) This review should focus on MWA vs. RFA. The Introduction part is too long (page 3 to upper part of page 6). Newer RFA equipment, such as multipolar needle, is not discussed.

**Answer:** we have shortened the introduction as per your suggestion, and added a new section to discuss RFA/MWA equipment and electrodes (pages 7, 8).

(4) Evolving MWA and RFA instruments

**Answer:** Evolving MWA and RFA instruments are now discussed under a new subheading "Evolution of electrodes" in the revised text (pages 7, 8)

(5) In the conclusion section (page 13), the authors state "RFA and MWA constitute the backbone of palliative treatments in HCC". This is not appropriate. RFA and MWA are categorized as curative treatments.

**Answer:** We agree. We have deleted this phrase in the revised text.

(6) The authors can give more instructive comments in the conclusion section.

**Answer:** The conclusion has been expanded to include more information.

(7) Table 1 is redundant. The authors can refer the readers to the major HCC guidelines for BCLC

staging.

**Answer:** We omitted Table 1 as per your suggestion. Tables are re-ordered in the revised text as Table1: “Comparison of RFA over MWA methods” and Table 2: “Comparison of clinical outcomes across published series of HCC patients for MWA over RFA”

3 References and typesetting were corrected

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Hepatology*

Sincerely yours,

Loukas Thanos, MD,

Department of Medical Imaging and Interventional Radiology

Sotiria General Hospital for Chest Diseases

Mesogeion Av. 152, Athens 11527, Greece

Tel: +30-210-7763362, Fax: +30-210-7707345, email: loutharad@yahoo.com