



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14941

Title: SURVIVAL RATES ACCORDING TO BCLC SUB-STAGING SYSTEM AFTER TRANSARTERIAL EMBOLIZATION FOR INTERMEDIATE HEPATOCELLULAR CARCINOMA

Reviewer's code: 00185713

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-11-01 09:35

Date reviewed: 2014-11-03 17:21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed 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		[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 discussion could be more relevant

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14941

Title: SURVIVAL RATES ACCORDING TO BCLC SUB-STAGING SYSTEM AFTER TRANSARTERIAL EMBOLIZATION FOR INTERMEDIATE HEPATOCELLULAR CARCINOMA

Reviewer's code: 01588404

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-11-01 09:35

Date reviewed: 2014-11-17 16:55

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed 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		[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

This is an interesting manuscript where the authors have analysed the difference in survival between different subgroups in BCLC Stage B HCC after TAE. Major point 1. In the Methods section the authors should describe the b subgroups in tabular form. 2. The median survival has not been shown for subgroups. 3. The number of sessions of TAE has been shown for PVA versus beads. It should also be shown for B subgroups. 4. Infact the table 1 should basically have demographic, tumor characteritics, etc related to BCLC stage rather than PVA and ME which can be shown in a separate table or in the text in results. 5. The authors need to report the response according to RECIST as it is important to know if only the survival varies with advancing B staging or the response also varies. 6. Discussion needs to be expanded with the potential reasons for difference in survival. Since the authors have not used AFP(surrogate marker for tumor burden and biology) the 4 groups essentially differ in tumor burden and baseline liver functions. This needs to be stressed that the final outcome may be a measure of interplay underlying liver disease and tumor burden.