

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 13479

Title: Strategies to improve outcome of patients with hepatocellular carcinoma receiving a liver transplantation

Reviewer code: 00504952

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-08-25 17:06

Date reviewed: 2014-09-05 17:02

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Manuscript reviewed liver transplantation for treatment of liver cancer. Manuscript is redundant and not focused. There are few studies in human as the number of patient is quite limited. Therefore, clinical guideline of liver transplantation for liver cancer is different in each country and institute. This is the current condition, anyone agrees. What is most important message in each section, shown in previous clinical studies? The authors should make it clear. As authors pointed out number of each clinical study is quite few. The authors should describe good experimental studies.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 13479

Title: Strategies to improve outcome of patients with hepatocellular carcinoma receiving a liver transplantation

Reviewer code: 02861055

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-08-25 17:06

Date reviewed: 2014-11-14 22:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Guerrero-Misas et al. submitted their paper to World Journal of Hepatology for peer review. The Authors review current literature on strategies to improve prognosis of hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) after liver transplantation. Because of the lack of general consensus on many aspects of the management of liver transplantation in the context of HCC, the subject of the review is interesting. A number of issues are listed below.

- The reading of the manuscript is hampered by redundancy. Concepts are repeated throughout the paper. Despite the intrinsic complexity of the subject, the Authors should clearly state the central message of each paragraph, avoid repetitions, condense sections which cannot be expanded in the present review (e.g. markers of aggressive tumor behaviour) and omit unnecessary details (e.g. pag 14, paragraph on immunosuppression and oncogenesis).
- The abstract of the paper is too short. The Authors should add details of the subjects debated in the text and possibly insert data.
- Reference citations are missing in the text (e.g. pag 8 "Many studies have shown that patients with poorly differentiated tumours have increased risk of recurrence and reduced survival rates"; pag 12 "In spite of this, RFA is preferred for single tumours less than 5 cm").
- In the section "Waiting list management" the Authors deal with the well-know problem of the waiting list management for HCC patients. However, the second part is about locoregional therapies as a bridging strategy to liver transplantation. The Author should refine the title of the section or avoid including those data.
- The Authors should make sure that



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>

each abbreviation is expanded at first use in the text. - The text is a mix of British and American English. The Authors should adopt one (preferably American English) and check for consistency. Moreover, there are a number of minor grammar errors that should be revised.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 13479

Title: Strategies to improve outcome of patients with hepatocellular carcinoma receiving a liver transplantation

Reviewer code: 02861134

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-08-25 17:06

Date reviewed: 2014-11-16 02:32

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study is a timely research. Objectives are consistent with literature review and analysis. The paper can be recommended to publish with the prior approval of the editorial board.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 13479

Title: Strategies to improve outcome of patients with hepatocellular carcinoma receiving a liver transplantation

Reviewer code: 00186136

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-08-25 17:06

Date reviewed: 2014-10-04 18:32

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very interesting review on HCC criteria for liver transplantation. Well organized and easy to read.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 13479

Title: Strategies to improve outcome of patients with hepatocellular carcinoma receiving a liver transplantation

Reviewer code: 02861131

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-08-25 17:06

Date reviewed: 2014-11-21 06:14

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Manuscript Number: 13479 Manuscript Title: STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE OUTCOME OF PATIENTS WITH HEPATOCELLULAR CARCINOMA RECEIVING A LIVER TRANSPLANTATION Comments to Authors GENERAL COMMENTS (1) The importance of the research and the significance of the research contents; The authors of this article have been evaluated the strategies to improve outcome of patients with hepatocellular carcinoma receiving a liver transplantation. The importance and significant of the research contents is high, because the shortage of donors is universal and causes an imbalance between candidates for liver transplantation and number of organs available. The adequate management of waiting list need to provide guarantee an equal access to liver transplantation for patients with different etiologies of liver disease. Medical community has not established yet the optimal balance between length within waiting list and outcome after liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma patients. The tumor recurrence rates after liver transplantation are 15%-20% (very high). In this condition, new modern strategies to minimize hepatocellular carcinoma recurrence after liver transplantation the most significant research topic. (2) The novelty and innovation of the research; Guerrero-Misas M et al has presented new modern strategies to minimize hepatocellular carcinoma recurrence after liver transplantation. The novelty of the research represents the idea that the main important point in modern strategies are: 1) Adequate selection of candidates for liver transplantation; 2) 2)

Prioritization of hepatocellular carcinoma patients from waiting list (optimal balance between length within waiting list and outcome after liver transplantation) and 3) Necessity to develop new immunosuppressive drugs with antiproliferative properties, able to prevent tumor recurrence in high-risk patients. (3) Presentation and readability of the manuscript; Review is well-organized and systematic theoretical analyses. The author provided valuable conclusions. This review is a classically presented scientific article. NB. Need to avoid repetition, give a definition of abbreviation written at first in manuscript, check spelling and grammar errors. (4) Ethics of the research. Not relevant for this article (this article is review of medical articles) **SPECIFIC COMMENTS** Title: reflects the major topic and contents of the study. Abstract: The abstract should include the same sections as the main text in a succinct form—introduction and objective, main topics and conclusion Introduction: present relevant information about epidemiology of hepatocellular carcinoma and liver transplantation as a therapeutic option able to treat both the hepatocellular carcinoma and the underlying liver disease. The introduction should define the topic and purpose of the review and describe its relevance to practice. Body of the review Selection of HCC patients for LT In this part of review authors presented many different criteria of selection for liver transplantation, but a liberal policy of selection would not only impair the outcome in the transplanted patient, but would also limit the access to LT of patients with other liver diseases, particularly in areas with increased incidence rates of HCC. Waiting list management In this division, we found that the most important thinks is optimal balance between length within waiting list and outcome after liver transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma patients! Strategies to improve outcome after liver transplantation Guerrero-Misas M et al present the idea that we need further studies to identify noninvasive biomarkers of hepatocellular carcinoma with prognostic capability, to establish the optimal management within waiting list, and to develop new immunosuppressive drugs with antiproliferative properties, able to prevent tumour recurrence in high-risk patients. Conclusions The authors present valuable co