

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Oncology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 20540

**Title:** Current treatment options for patients with initially unresectable isolated colorectal liver metastases

**Reviewer's code:** 00724342

**Reviewer's country:** Serbia

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-06-14 18:26

**Date reviewed:** 2015-06-21 02:37

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"/> [ Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very well-written manuscript and the only thing missing are tables. Regardless that it deserves to be published in WJCO

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Oncology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 20540

**Title:** Current treatment options for patients with initially unresectable isolated colorectal liver metastases

**Reviewer's code:** 01561116

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-06-14 18:26

**Date reviewed:** 2015-08-24 16:51

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" 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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reported that literatures review about chemotherapy and conversion therapy for isolated colorectal liver metastases. They reported the difference of objective responses and R0 secondary resection rates in various chemotherapy regimens and also reported those in hepatic arterial infusion chemotherapies. The interpretation of the literatures is correct and the review is informative for practical clinicians in this field. They should fully spelled out the abbreviations of the studies such as BOXER, TRIBE, OLIVA and POCHER.