

**ESPS Peer-review Report****Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8519**Title:** Criteria-specific long-term survival predicting model for hepatocellular carcinoma patients after liver transplantation: a single-center experience**Reviewer code:** 00006850**Science editor:** Su-Xin Gou**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-29 19:14**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-29 22:44

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	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Enclosed find please my comment to the manuscript by Fei et al., entitled "Criteria-specific long-term survival predicting model for hepatocellular carcinoma patients after liver transplantation: a single-center experience". This study is well written and provide information to the reader of the world journal of Gastroenterology. However, the english language needs more improvement at different places overall the manuscript. With regards Mohamed Hassan

# ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8519

**Title:** Criteria-specific long-term survival predicting model for hepatocellular carcinoma patients after liver transplantation: a single-center experience

**Reviewer code:** 00374038

**Science editor:** Su-Xin Gou

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-29 19:14

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-30 16:13

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 checked="" 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

This manuscript describes a model to predict long-term survival of hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) patients after liver transplantation. The study design is scientifically sound and the findings are of potential clinical significance. Comments 1. It might be better if the different criteria (Milan criteria, University of California San Francisco (UCSF) criteria, Hangzhou criteria and Shanghai Fudan) were described in the Introduction section rather than in the Methods. 2. Were the patients recruited retrospectively or prospectively? How did retrospectively recruited patients provide a consent form? 3. Was there an age or other factors limit in the study? The inclusion criteria should be stated. 4. At what time point the values of various variables were taken? Is it at admission or later or within 24 hours of operation? 5. The primary outcomes need to be clearly defined at the beginning. The recurrence of the HCC is also important. And, how to confirmed using ultrasonography scan, computed tomography scan and emission computed tomography scan, AFP in follow-up? 6. The value of c-statistic should be stated. 7. Comparisons of the four ROCs should be listed. 8. The sensitivity and specificity of the cut-off value need to be list. 9. There is a great deal of repetition in Discussion. This needs to be removed. 10. The language needs to be improved.