

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19616

Title: Radiofrequency ablation with or without transarterial chemoembolization for hepatocellular carcinoma: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 03368047

Reviewer's country: Canada

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-05-15 17:22

Date reviewed: 2015-05-21 02:23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors The article entitled ' Comparing effectiveness of radiofrequency ablation with or without transarterial chemoembolization for hepatocellular carcinoma: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trails' is interesting, well-written and should be published. Prior to publication, I recommend the following modifications or additional data. - Abstract: clear statement that the paper compared trials done in China and Japan - Discuss the findings (why such results with the size and with Chinese population). - Introduction: describ RFA and TACE procedures (few lines) -Methods: -Describ how RFA and TACE were done. Make a statement that the procedure didnt change your finding (for exeample: TACE was done with drug eluting beads, lipiodol and beads ?) - As a suggestion, RR results could be difficult to understand by people not in the field of clinical trial, you could give an example how to analyse the values. - Results: - third line before the end: a space is required between 5 and cm. - Discussion - The results of this review are very interesting. Please discuss more the results by adding scientific elements on how RFA is more efficient when the blood flow is reduced or cells are dying because of chemoembolizqtion. - For 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

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

difference between Japan and Chinese populations: discuss more this finding. -Last paragraph, the first sentence should be written again (unclear). I hope that these comments will help to improve your article.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19616

Title: Radiofrequency ablation with or without transarterial chemoembolization for hepatocellular carcinoma: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00160312

Reviewer's country: Philippines

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-05-15 17:22

Date reviewed: 2015-06-16 17:53

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Since an analysis and a forest plot was made, it is probably worth mentioning that based on available literature, there is no difference between the RFA and the TACE+RFA groups in terms of 5 year recurrence free survival.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19616

Title: Radiofrequency ablation with or without transarterial chemoembolization for hepatocellular carcinoma: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 03119228

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-05-15 17:22

Date reviewed: 2015-06-17 18:21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

We are sorry to reject your submission. This manuscript should be better prepared in design, results presentation and references citation. In addition, it is very important to study seriously about meta analysis once you had decided to write and submit a relevant manuscript. I could not accept your submission as a good systemic review at all.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19616

Title: Radiofrequency ablation with or without transarterial chemoembolization for hepatocellular carcinoma: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00068443

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-05-15 17:22

Date reviewed: 2015-06-19 15:36

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript, authors investigated whether the combined TACE-RFA therapy can improve overall survival rate and recurrence-free rate as compared with RFA alone by meta-analysis of RCTs. The manuscript is well prepared and clearly written, however there are some minor issues which should be addressed. 1.The meta-analysis results should be clearly illustrated in the RESULTS. 2.The frequency of RFA and TACE for patients, or only once? 3.The interval time of RFA and TACE. 4.conventional TACE or TACE with other drugs or beads?