



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 36618

Title: Control, Survival, and Liver Function Preservation for Hepatocellular Carcinoma (HCC) and Child Pugh-A Cirrhosis Treated with Definitive Stereotactic Body Radiotherapy (SBRT).

Reviewer's code: 01805500

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2017-10-20

Date reviewed: 2017-10-20

Review time: 8 Hours

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 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"/> 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

Authors should give some more information about liver the cirrhosis cause....i.e., this case of immunosuppression (1), and that of one was unknown origin should be classified as criptogenetic. In table and Figures C-P scores should be properly expressed. What does C-P progression mean? It should be opportunely clarified. The C-P classification used by authors should be referenced, referring to a modern one, as presented in.....What are the implications of the spontaneous spleno-renal shunts in liver cirrhosis? BMC Gastroenterol. 2009 Nov 24;9:89



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 36618

Title: Control, Survival, and Liver Function Preservation for Hepatocellular Carcinoma (HCC) and Child Pugh-A Cirrhosis Treated with Definitive Stereotactic Body Radiotherapy (SBRT).

Reviewer's code: 00053659

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2017-10-20

Date reviewed: 2017-10-20

Review time: 12 Hours

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 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 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"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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

Hasan et al reported a retrospective study of the Stereotactic Body Radiotherapy (SBRT) for patients who had an early stage hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC). Although indication for SBRT rather than the other options of the therapy was unclear, it might contain some relevant information for future therapy. I recommend the authors should revise figs and text including refs carefully. You should follow the instruction of the proper journal. You should not submit text with previous reviewer's comments. Furthermore, you did not change the previous text at all. Table 1; Patient characteristics should present more precisely. You could present it with cox proportional hazard models. Was there any additional treatment after SBRT? It was unclear how many patients received additional treatment and what was it? What was



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

tumor response after SBRT? Was there any change regarding vascularity? In addition, you should present TMN classification as well. I disagree with your conclusion. Because deterioration of CP score was seen in almost half patients after one year. It was too fast to deteriorate liver function compared to other therapy in general. It must be radiation, did it? This information is interesting. It seems to be negative impression, but it is an important to avoid further clinical trial. Overall the study was poor due to lack of clinical information and statistical analysis. Please revise it all including previous reviewers comments.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 36618

Title: Control, Survival, and Liver Function Preservation for Hepatocellular Carcinoma (HCC) and Child Pugh-A Cirrhosis Treated with Definitive Stereotactic Body Radiotherapy (SBRT).

Reviewer's code: 00053888

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2017-10-20

Date reviewed: 2017-10-23

Review time: 3 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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

The authors have presented an interesting and well constructed paper looking at safety, tolerability & outcome in patients with early liver disease treated with SBRT. The paper has a reasonable number of patients given the wide range of presentation and treatment options available. The authors are also realistic in their conclusions about the reliability of this type of data. My only real concern is the 8 patients who went on to have a transplant as this will inevitably skew the data considerably and I would suggest that they should be treated entirely differently in terms of outcome. Otherwise the paper is worthy of publication.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 36618

Title: Control, Survival, and Liver Function Preservation for Hepatocellular Carcinoma (HCC) and Child Pugh-A Cirrhosis Treated with Definitive Stereotactic Body Radiotherapy (SBRT).

Reviewer's code: 02438768

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2017-10-20

Date reviewed: 2017-10-30

Review time: 10 Days

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 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"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" 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

Comments for ESPS Manuscript NO 36618

1. General comments The paper tackles an interesting topic. However, I have some comments regarding the paper.

2. Specific comments

(1)Major comments:

①The authors should submit a revised manuscript rather than one previous reviewer's comments.

②The references used in this paper are rather confusing, thus the authors should give the proper level of attention to citations and reference sections.

(2)Minor comments: The format of this manuscript should be revised according to the journal's requirement.