

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5680

Title: Systemic therapy for hepatocellular carcinoma: current status and future perspectives

Reviewer code: 00181388

Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan

Date sent for review: 2013-09-24 10:18

Date reviewed: 2013-09-24 22:50

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"/> Existed	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors My comments are as below: 1. Although, this is a narrative review; however, we need to know their key words in search ing literature, their criteria for selection studies (papers), and their focus for data extraction from selected studie. Such information make this study reproducible. I offer authors add small part about their methods. 2. MeSH words are preferred as key words at the end of abstract. Please revise, if possible. 3. I did not see any part showing conflict of interest. It is important in such review articles. Bests,

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5680

Title: Systemic therapy for hepatocellular carcinoma: current status and future perspectives

Reviewer code: 00070577

Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan

Date sent for review: 2013-09-24 10:18

Date reviewed: 2013-09-27 12:59

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" 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 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"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reviewed about "Systemic Therapy of hepatocellular carcinoma: current status and future perspectives". The theme is interesting but to improve the manuscript, I listed the following concerns. 1) Description of systemic therapy is poor. Although there are not so many treatment methods, each doctors devise the way to treat them. I think the authors should explore previous literature more. 2) Very recently, "Prognosis of Patients with Advanced Hepatocellular Carcinoma Who Failed First-Line Systemic Therapy" was published on line by Journal of Hepatology. The authors should include this. 3) The author should re-built the frame of the manuscript. For example, Sunitinib is multikinase inhibitor like sorafenib but included in the antiangiogenic agents. 4) The author listed many new drugs, but I think it is very hard to read for the general reader. The authors should make tables or figures in which the drug character and outcome from the therapy ...etc. are mentioned to understand the overview.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5680

Title: Systemic therapy for hepatocellular carcinoma: current status and future perspectives

Reviewer code: 00069966

Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan

Date sent for review: 2013-09-24 10:18

Date reviewed: 2013-10-02 09:33

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	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

The manuscript entitle" Systemic Therapy of hepatocellular carcinoma: current status and future perspectives" by Germano and Daniele was review the management of hepatocellular carcinoma by several kind of molecular targentd agents. This review is accetable for publication.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5680

Title: Systemic therapy for hepatocellular carcinoma: current status and future perspectives

Reviewer code: 02527847

Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan

Date sent for review: 2013-09-24 10:18

Date reviewed: 2013-10-04 23:32

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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Nice work, however discussion section should include a paragraph to stress the difference in vasculature between xenograft and orthotopic tumors (liver vasculature). As we know, many drugs work well in xenograft tumors but are not effective in patients, partly due to different organ vascularization. The conclusion should include the statement to emphasize additional testing in PDX and orthotopic models that are deemed more predictive for outcome in patients.