

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 16165

Title: Management of hepatocellular carcinoma rupture in the caudate lobe

Reviewer's code: 02989321

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-01-01 14:31

Date reviewed: 2015-01-18 06:43

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present a case series on a rare clinical condition, the management of which cannot be examined in higher-level studies because of low incidence. The approach they suggest is well accepted and is presented with all necessary details. The paper is well written and provides a sound basis for further discussion

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 16165

Title: Management of hepatocellular carcinoma rupture in the caudate lobe

Reviewer's code: 03004185

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-01-01 14:31

Date reviewed: 2015-01-15 04:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, it was a great pleasure and a very informative challenge to me to review our case series on management of HCC rupture in liver segment I. I can only congratulate for your excellent results in a surgically very demanding situation to perform isolated segment I resection under oncological aspects in patients with liver cirrhosis and consequent coagulatory disturbances. Your result and survival data are really impressive! Again, it was a great honour to review your article.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 16165

Title: Management of hepatocellular carcinoma rupture in the caudate lobe

Reviewer's code: 00054593

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-01-01 14:31

Date reviewed: 2015-01-15 16:00

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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

This is an interesting article. Few questions for the authors to address. 1. It is unclear that why patients can wait for few days before caudate lobectomy. It seems that the acute bleeding episode have been stopped before this procedure? 2. Any consideration of radiofrequency ablation or open surgical packing to control bleeding if failed TAE. 3. The Discussion session is too long and whole paper should be double-spacing. 4. This is certainly difficult to persuade people to perform emergency caudate lobectomy in the setting of ruptured HCC. What is the centre policy and how about if the rupture is at other sites?