



# Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8755

**Title:** Clinical Outcome of small hepatocellular carcinoma with different treatments: a meta-analysis

**Reviewer code:** 00061678

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2014-01-06 18:07

**Date reviewed:** 2014-01-13 00:33

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Editor, authors Thanks for sending the manuscript "Clinical outcome of small hepatocellular carcinoma with different treatments:a meta analysis." - An important subject but actually no novelty. - Retrospective study has weak points like no sufficient clinical data related to the cases like other co morbid conditions which might affect survival. \_ Again authors rely on their results upon difference in 5 year survival without mentioned other data related to the patients that can affect survival. - Minor language polishing needed. Thanks



## Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

---

### ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8755

**Title:** Clinical Outcome of small hepatocellular carcinoma with different treatments: a meta-analysis

**Reviewer code:** 00053786

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2014-01-06 18:07

**Date reviewed:** 2014-01-16 01:07

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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)		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

Same comments to the authors as sent to the editor.



## Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

### ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8755

**Title:** Clinical Outcome of small hepatocellular carcinoma with different treatments: a meta-analysis

**Reviewer code:** 00009064

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2014-01-06 18:07

**Date reviewed:** 2014-01-24 22:34

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 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

I agree with the conclusions made by you and the methods used. However, there are multiple english language mistakes which you should get corrected.



# Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8755

**Title:** Clinical Outcome of small hepatocellular carcinoma with different treatments: a meta-analysis

**Reviewer code:** 00068090

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2014-01-06 18:07

**Date reviewed:** 2014-01-29 01:56

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 checked="" 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

COMMENTS: ESPS Manuscript NO: 8755) Clinical Outcome of small hepatocellular carcinoma with different treatments: a meta-analysis. 1) Meta-analysis, a quantitative technique for therapeutic evaluation, may be used when controversy persists after several trials. The conclusions of this meta-analysis presented by the authors are limited by various factors: i) the number of studies that are included in this review is few, and this may lead to false positive or false negative conclusions (risk of random errors); ii) the majority of data in the present study comes from NRCTs. Meta-analysis has traditionally been applied and is best confined to RCT, in this study that a very limited number of quality RCTs were available and included in this meta-analysis meta-analytical techniques using non-randomized controlled trials (NRCT) in which either the number or the sample size of RCT is insufficient. 2) The authors should include a systematic review to assess survival, complete tumor necrosis, recurrence and metastasis, major complications, costs, hospital stays, and post-treatment survival quality of RES versus nRES for treating small HCCs. 3) It is known that Radiofrequency thermal ablation (RF) and percutaneous ethanol injection (PEI) have been employed in the treatment of small hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) as curative treatments. The study of Orlando et al. review the available evidence comparing RF to PEI for small HCC. The authors found that RF ablation is superior to PEI in the treatment of small HCC with respect to overall survival, 1, 2, and 3 years survival rates, 1, 2, and 3 cancer-free survival rates, and tumor response, also, RF shows a significantly smaller risk of local recurrence. In this work the authors do not include differences between different no surgical resection treatments. It is other limited factor of this work 4) The work present a few novelty data and do not brings new relevant information in therapeutic evaluation of small hepatocellular carcinoma to other works already published