

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22820

Title: Liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma beyond the Milan criteria: A review.

Reviewer's code: 00054271

Reviewer's country: Belgium

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-09-28 14:05

Date reviewed: 2015-10-06 23:43

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I reviewed with pleasure the manuscript entitled "Liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma beyond the Milan criteria: A review " and submitted for publication in the World Journal of Gastroenterology. In this review, the authors present the different criteria of LT for HCC, and as well as the biomarkers. This manuscript is well-written and deserves to be published. However, in order to help the readers with all the different classifications, it would be nice if the authors could add one or 2 tables summarizing and comparing the different criteria.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22820

Title: Liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma beyond the Milan criteria: A review.

Reviewer's code: 02937188

Reviewer's country: Poland

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-09-28 14:05

Date reviewed: 2015-10-11 22:51

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript provides a well-written summary of the existing expansions of Milan criteria in liver transplantation for HCC, along with several additional issues. I have following suggestions: 1. A table or 2 summarizing existing expansions of Milan criteria may be helpful to potential readers. 2. What is the opinion of the Authors on differences in qualification of patients for LDLT and DDLT? Should selection criteria differ? 3. I would elaborate more about the theoretical advantages and disadvantages of LDLT vs. DDLT. 4. Please add some information on the prognostic value of complete pathologic response after neoadjuvant treatment. 5. The authors provided some information on the prognostic value of static AFP concentrations. What about the dynamic changes of tumor markers? 6. Please add some information on the choice of appropriate surgical technique, and whether it should differ in patients within and beyond MC.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22820

Title: Liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma beyond the Milan criteria: A review.

Reviewer's code: 00053950

Reviewer's country: Finland

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-09-28 14:05

Date reviewed: 2015-10-12 19:57

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The focus of the paper was to review advances in LT beyond the Milan criteria. The authors describe various extended criteria and disclose their advantages and drawbacks. In addition they list biomarkers used in assessing the grade of HCC. The last chapter of the paper is about downstaging of HCC for LT. Remarks - There is not much new in the paper, but it may give the clinician more background in accepting HCC patients on the LT list. - The authors underline the Asian criteria, which may work better in Asian patients with viral hepatitis induced HCC than in alcohol cirrhosis of the western countries. - There is nothing new in biomarkers, AFP, PIVKA-II or NLR. The value of CRP may also be challenged. - The use of PET is also contradictory in HCC. - The TACE and RFA are widely used to treat small HCCs of patients on the waiting list. The role of downstaging instead is poorly evaluated. - LDLT arises risks for the donor, and the method should not be used for cases with poor prognosis. - The value of posttransplant adjuvant treatment with sorafenib or mTORinhibitors is still unproven.