

Dr. Pierandrea De Iaco
Responsabile SSD Oncologia Ginecologica
Policlinico Sant'Orsola-Malpighi
Via Massarenti 13 - 40138 Bologna
Fax: 0516364392
Cell: 3356666354

pierandrea.deiaco@aosp.bo.it

March 11, 2013

Paper Title: Natural history of Epithelial Ovarian Cancer and its relation to surgical and medical treatment

World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology. ESPS Manuscript NO: 1467

Dear Editor,

We have now performed all revisions requested by the Reviewers.

Please address our answers to the Reviewers and explain that this paper is an introduction to the use of HIPEC on ovarian cancer.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any further questions.

Yours faithfully,

Pierandrea De Iaco

Title: Natural history of Epithelial Ovarian Cancer and its relation to surgical and medical treatment

Authors: Pierandrea De Iaco MD¹, Anna Myriam Perrone MD, PhD¹, Martina Procaccini MD¹, Alice Pellegrini MD¹, Philippe Morice MD².

¹Gynecologic Oncology Unit, Sant'Orsola Malpighi Hospital, Bologna, Italy

²Gynecologic Oncology Unit, Gustave Roussy Institute, Villejuif, France

The manuscript has been amended according to Reviewers' suggestions:

R1: I don't understand the aim of the manuscript. Do the authors propose 8 instead of 5 time points where they want to evaluate HIPEC? Do they want to use HIPEC for chemosensitiv and chemoinsensitiv patients (figure 2)? There is no conclusion.

Currently HIPEC is proposed in chemo-sensitive and chemo-insensitive patients. The five time-points proposed by the Consensus of the Peritoneal Surface Oncology Group (Helm *et.al.* 2008) in the natural history of Ovarian Cancer do not consider chemo-sensitivity.

Our work is a generic introduction monograph on HIPEC in advanced ovarian cancer. Our aim was an excursive on advanced ovarian cancer and on different treatments with particular attention to times where HIPEC can be performed. For this reason we did not use the classic introduction, materials & methods and conclusion division. A detailed description will be undertaken by other authors in the next edition of the monograph.

R2: This review has some important points to be modified. In the TITLE is better to substitute EOC by the original word. ABSTRACT is not clear (it seems as copy of the INTRODUCTION, and with citation of authors (Chua et al), which is not usual for abstracts. In the ABSTRACT, I suggest to the Authors to concisely organize and build it in this form: background and why they did the review, how they did - methodology, results, and the conclusion. The KEY-WORDS are too general, not specific. Regarding the INTRODUCTION, it seems the beginning of the review itself, rather than a true introduction in the field. There are no METHODS, which is not obligatory in reviews, but could give more transparency in the process, I mean on where and how the Authors did their review. I suggest to include a TABLE including results of the most important papers/trials/cohorts, which could be very interesting in a paper like this one. There is no CONCLUSION, and the Authors let the 2 figures/flowcharts for the last 2 paragraphs. In short, this review can be published only with a major review.

Title: EOC has been substituted with full words (Epithelial Ovarian Cancer)

Abstract: This has been modified and divided into sections: Background, Methods and Results and Conclusions.

Key words: These have been modified and now are more specific.

Introduction: As we responded to Reviewer 1, our work is a generic introduction monograph on HIPEC in advanced ovarian cancer. Our aim was an excursive on advanced ovarian cancer and on different treatments paying particular attention to times where HIPEC can be performed. For this reason we did not use the classic introduction,

materials & methods and conclusion division. A detailed description will be undertaken by other authors in the next edition of the monograph.

Table: A table (Table 1) has been included showing major studies (Page 6).