



**ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 13574

**Title:** Surgical management of hepatocellular carcinoma

**Reviewer code:** 01561116

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2014-08-29 17:04

**Date reviewed:** 2014-09-27 20:50

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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**

The authors reported overview of the surgical management of hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) and several current issues related to these treatments. Thus, there seems to be several points to explain more in the review. Moreover there are several mistakes in writing and the English should be improved and proof-read by native specialist. Major 1. The author should emphasize about the high recurrence rate after hepatic resection. In the patients with multiple HCCs and good liver function, the tumors can resectable and cure for a while, however the recurrent rate is very high and it related to poor prognosis. Then resection is discussing with comparison to less invasive treatments such as radiofrequency ablation (RFA) or transarterial chemoembolization (TACE) or these combination therapy in such cases. 2. The author should be discussed about issues related “surveillance for HCC in chronic hepatitis C virus or hepatitis B virus infection.” Because the almost of the symptomatic patients with HCC are already in advanced stage, they can’t treat with surgical resection or transplantation. Also HCC is one of cancers in which we can set high risk groups. 3. There may be not only selection bias but publication bias or others for systematic review related the topic “laparoscopic liver resection.” 4. The authors should discuss about disadvantage of laparoscopic resection because they seem to emphasize the advantage. 5. As ablative therapy, RFA is favored more than percutaneous ethanol injection (PEI). The authors should find systematic reviews comparing RFA with surgical resection. 6. The authors should be discussed about ethical issues when they mention about randomized controlled trial comparing resection with transplantation. 7. In core-tip, the



## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

authors mention about local expertise but they little discuss about it. Minor 1. In introduction, the authors used "standard potentially curative treatments." The authors should explain "standard" and also the definition of curative treatment because radiofrequency ablation is also included in the category of curative treatment in some cases. 2. In page 4 line 13, "in the west" should be "in the western countries." 3. In page 4 line 14, "late" should be "advanced." 4. The meaning of "Also, whilst tumor size and number are factors associated with poorer survival, these are neither the only nor the most important factors influencing survival" is difficult to understand. 5. In page 5 line 6, "Child Pugh" should be "Child-Pugh." 6. The authors should be clearly described "hepatic vein pressure gradient" is reflects "portal vein pressure." 7. "If inadequate future liver remnant is not achievable" should be "If inadequate future liver remnant is achievable" or "If adequate future liver remnant is not achievable." 8. The authors should add references after the sentence "There have been several systematic reviews on this topic." 9. In page 9 line 6, "patients operated on for non-cancer indications" should be "those of patients operated on for non-cancer indications." 10. In page 9 line 11, "Those outside criteria" means outside of Milan criteria or outside of UCSF criteria"?



# 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:** 13574

**Title:** Surgical management of hepatocellular carcinoma

**Reviewer code:** 00004882

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2014-08-29 17:04

**Date reviewed:** 2014-10-02 12:11

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

None