

**ESPS Peer-review Report**

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7239

**Title:** Living Donor Liver Transplantation Does Not Increase Tumor Recurrence of Hepatocellular Carcinoma Compared to Deceased Donor Transplantation

**Reviewer code:** 00054174

**Science editor:** Ma, Ya-Juan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-11-13 11:56

**Date reviewed:** 2014-02-10 23:18

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)	<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**

1. According to table 1, 84 recipients were in LDLT group, but there was only 80 collected data in AFP and tumor number. 2. some investigators addressed that inadequate time to assess the biological behavior of the tumor and insufficient preoperative treatments may increased the recurrence rate of LDLT, but the current study suggested otherwise. And that, in the author's view, is biological assessment and fully pre-treatments no-longer necessary or important before LT?

**ESPS Peer-review Report**

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7239

**Title:** Living Donor Liver Transplantation Does Not Increase Tumor Recurrence of Hepatocellular Carcinoma Compared to Deceased Donor Transplantation

**Reviewer code:** 00068250

**Science editor:** Ma, Ya-Juan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-11-13 11:56

**Date reviewed:** 2014-02-12 18:43

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 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**

1 The statement of "Liver transplantation is the best choice" is not always appropriate. The authors should explain the condition and circumstance of its use according to criteria. 2 The conclusion part of the abstract is not compatible with the title. 3 There is a statistically significant difference in the preoperative adjuvant therapy between the two groups. The authors need to provide the detailed information of the therapies and explain whether these therapies have an impact on the results. 4 Apart from HBV infection, other factors cause tumor recurrence. The authors need to discuss these factors and their effects on the results. 5 Please correct numerous typo errors. Grammatical and punctuation errors exist.