



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

**Manuscript NO:** 69907

**Title:** Liver resection vs radiofrequency ablation in single hepatocellular carcinoma of posterosuperior segments in elderly patients

**Reviewer's code:** 02527549

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-07-22

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-07-22 07:58

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-07-22 08:46

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

General comment: the authors compared clinical outcomes (OS, DFS, Cx, etc) of RFA and LR in elderly patients with difficult location to treat (4a, 7, 8 segment). They used PSM to reduce any selection bias caused by nonrandomized retrospective study design. The results were similar between the two groups, however RFA had more advantages (reduced hospital stay etc) than LR in this specific patient cohort. Overall, this manuscript was very well written with excellent logic. I have minor comments about statistical issue. 1. The median OS b-PSM was 24.9 months and 24.5 months in the RFA and LR groups, respectively. The median OS a-PSM was 26.5 months and 25.9 months in the RFA and LR groups, respectively. However, when I looked at the KM graph, survival graphs of both groups were still above 50% until the end of F/U (60 months). Thus, median OS may not be calculated in this study, but can be expected to be longer than 60 months. 2. Also, median DFS b-PSM/a-PSM in both groups seemed to be longer than the values that the authors stated. Please check again, or consult a statistician if required.