



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6929

Title: Palliation of Hilar cholangiocarcinoma

Reviewer code: 02439777

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2013-11-06 08:42

Date reviewed: 2013-11-13 09:14

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review article well organized various palliative therapies for hilar cholangiocarcinoma. However, it mostly takes the method of simply listing previously published contents and it is missing the authors' own suggestions about indications of each palliative treatment modalities. This article needs extensive English editing by a native English speaker.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6929

Title: Palliation of Hilar cholangiocarcinoma

Reviewer code: 02445558

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2013-11-06 08:42

Date reviewed: 2013-12-02 03:25

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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would suggest a title "locoregional palliation of hilar cholangiocarcinoma" as palliative systemic chemotherapy is a chapter on its own and would require a lot of discussion and very little has been mentioned in the manuscript. For instance the ABC-01 and ABC-02 trials have compared combination chemotherapy with cisplatin and gemcitabine vs gemcitabine alone and this has not been mentioned at all. On page 5, in the second paragraph there is no reference to support the statement that 25% of drained liver is sufficient. On page 6 line 4 it is said that hilar stenting is associated with higher failure rate (than what? distal stricture?) On page 7 the authors suggest that here is very little data comparing endoscopic vs percutaneous drainage. It is correct and should be emphasized that no RCT has ever been done to compare the two drainage modalities. However, the guidelines for management published on Gut in 2002 by Khan et al and revised in Gut in 2012 by the same group, should be referenced and explained. On page 8 line 18 should read hepatico gastrostomy, not jejunostomy. Table 1 is not referenced and hepatic artery involvement is a relative contraindication. associated comorbidity should be considered is an important factor for non operability rather than non resectability. Table 2 does not have any p-values which should be added. table 4 and 5 should be updated with more recent references, they are not acceptable with articles from 10 years ago. The figures are nice and give some flavour to the article but figure nr 8 does not represent accurately the hepaticojejunostomy as the gallbladder is in situ and the anastomosis is on the distal rather than the proximal bile duct. The English language needs considerable polishing and corrections.

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6929

Title: Palliation of Hilar cholangiocarcinoma

Reviewer code: 01544019

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2013-11-06 08:42

Date reviewed: 2013-12-02 13:41

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Fig 2 needs addition of explanation of each figures. 2. Fig 3 needs addition of explanation of each figures. 3. Table 1 needs reference. 4. What means the "sign" on Table 2? 5. Table 3, You'd better to describe clearly on the table as below and the 45 days is not correct. You should change it to 46. 1 lobe opacified & stented → one love opacified with same lobe drained / both opacified & stented → both lobes opacified with both lobes drained / both opacified, 1 stented → both lobes opacified with just one lobe drained 6. Table 5, biliary stent → biliary stenting / stent → stenting only / stent with PDT → stenting with PDT 7. Fig 4 needs addition of explanation of each figures and if the figures quoted from other authors, please describe the references. 8. Fig 5 needs addition of explanation of each figures, insertion of type of stents, and name of the company. 9. Fig 6, Bismath Type I → Bismuth Type I 10. Fig 7, Percutancous → Percutaneous / B & C is not a schematic diagram. Please explain the pictures of stents, type of stents, and name of stents and company name. 11. Fig 8 needs explanation of schematic diagram. You quoted reference No. 50 in Table 5. However, you omitted it in the sentence. I recommend insertion of the reference No. 50 And if you needs, how about being quoted from the reference "Prospective study of the effectiveness of percutaneous transhepatic photodynamic therapy for advanced bile duct cancer and the role of intraductal ultrasonography in response assessment"?