

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27769

Title: Neuroendocrine neoplasms of liver – A 5 year retrospective clinico-pathological study applying WHO 2010 classification.

Reviewer's code: 00068153

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2016-06-17 11:17

Date reviewed: 2016-06-21 09:02

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 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

Neuroendocrine neoplasm in the liver is not a common disease. According to the authors, this is the largest study so far describing detailed histological findings and relevant clinical data of patients with hepatic neuroendocrine neoplasms. The authors had drawn some valuable conclusions for this disease.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27769

Title: Neuroendocrine neoplasms of liver – A 5 year retrospective clinico-pathological study applying WHO 2010 classification.

Reviewer's code: 01550488

Reviewer's country: Austria

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2016-06-17 11:17

Date reviewed: 2016-07-04 00:46

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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 authors report here on the pathological data of 79 patients with liver-metastasis of NET (including maybe a few primary liver NET's, but this is questionable). Their report is fairly comprehensive with a few weaknesses (see comments below), but overall not bad. Novelty is not too intriguing but seems acceptable. Reporting on outcome is inferior and should either be omitted (most likely) or much improved. Specific comments: -median 8.5 months of FU is too short to show any impact of grading on survival: this should be clearly indicated; especially also in the conclusion; death is not a short-term outcome in NET-patients, so this information is meaningless and could be cause for misinterpretation of the data; in my opinion, the authors should either try to get much better follow-up data or just indicate that follow-up is too incomplete to report. There is enough data out there to show the relation between grading and survival. -status of lymph node metastasis in these patients (interesting, since LN-metastasis is the the most common location for metastasis in NET's)? -the discussion needs to be shortened massively (is boring to read): there is no reason to repeat all the results (clinical presentation, interesting cases, granulomas, comparison of MVI, age,



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>

gender in different stage tumors, etc.); this can be discussed without repetition or omitted from the discussion at all. It does not make sense to discuss differences between groups that are very small and are likely chance findings. -the issue of MVI needs to be toned down: I am lacking a statement that most evaluations came from biopsies, which cannot be viewed as good diagnostic tests to evaluate MVI (is more a chance finding). This is the likely explanation that lower grade tumors (G1) have more MVI than higher grade tumors. Also, in a study only examining metastatic tumors to the liver, I would expect most of the lesions to have MVI. -I am lacking the comparison for MVI between primary tumors and metastasis, where available. I think this would be interesting.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27769

Title: Neuroendocrine neoplasms of liver – A 5 year retrospective clinico-pathological study applying WHO 2010 classification.

Reviewer's code: 00053419

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2016-06-17 11:17

Date reviewed: 2016-07-07 03:18

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors provide a comprehensive study of neuroendocrine neoplasms of liver that includes 79 patients, some interesting cases among them. The heterogeneity of the population studied should be taken into account. The results are clearly exposed but additional discussion would be appreciated to further interpret the coincidence or discrepancy with the studies performed by other authors. An overall conclusion at the end of the discussion would be also acknowledged.