

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 70614

**Title:** Evaluation of short- and medium-term efficacy and complications of ultrasound-guided ablation for small liver cancer

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05195324

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United Kingdom

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-11-30 12:19

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-12-06 10:29

**Review time:** 5 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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
-------------------------------------	---

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

General comments: Authors retrospectively analyzed the clinical efficacy and safety of ultrasound-guided percutaneous MWA in the treatment of 118 patients with small liver cancer treated at the Yongzhou Central Hospital of Hunan Province from January 2018 to December 2020. The manuscript is informative and well presentation. The reviewer has minor comments. Comments: 1- The Abstract is good enough and reflects the core content of the article. 2- The background part of the text is well written and presents status and significance of the study clearly. 3- Method: the paragraphs are generally well structured and explained. 4- Result: well and clearly presented with pertinent statistics. However, I have a small doubt. On page 8, the author first described that "The operation time, blood loss, hospital stay, and medical expenses in the MWA group were lower than those in the laparoscope group, and the differences were statistically significant". However, in the "Effects of surgical treatment on "Liver function indexes in two groups" parts, they also described some results related to operation time, blood loss, hospital stay, and medical expenses. Are they repeated? 5- Discussion: The manuscript clearly interprets the finding adequately and appropriately. In addition, the manuscript could highlight the key points clearly.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 70614

**Title:** Evaluation of short- and medium-term efficacy and complications of ultrasound-guided ablation for small liver cancer

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05338673

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Switzerland

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-11-30 12:20

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-12-06 10:29

**Review time:** 5 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

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

I read the manuscript written by Hua Zhong and others with great interest. In my honest opinion, the topic is interesting and the retrospectively studies novel enough to attract the readers' attention. The discussion section is well written. The authors clarified some points and cite relevant and novel key articles on the subject to discuss their findings. I just have some small comments: 1. The description of the observation indicators part of the method is incomplete, and it does not describe all the important indicators in the result description, for example: The operation time, blood loss, hospital stay, and medical expenses are not described. 2. Corresponding Statistical methods need to be completed in conjunction with observation indicators.