

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22177

Title: Factors associated with increased incidence of severe toxicities following yttrium-90 resin microspheres

Reviewer's code: 02495815

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-08-18 14:01

Date reviewed: 2015-09-02 03:08

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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript entitled as "Factors associated with increased incidence of severe toxicities following yttrium-90 resin microspheres" is a well designed and well-written original article. However, it is still need some minor revision: 1- The total number of treatments accepted for the data collection was given as 79 in 58 patients (page7, line 1-3).The total number of excluded studies was given as 24. So, total number of treatments (79+24) does not match with the total treatment number during 2010-2014. 2- Please make some comments about the reason for limited number (55) of follow-up after treatment (page 7, last 2 lines) 3- What is the treatment result for the rest of patients rather than partial response (23.3%) and stable disease (33.3%) ? (page 8, line 1-2) 4- The sentence starting with " Among our patients," should be re-writtten (page 8, line 9-11) 5- Please explain the " MELD Score" and the calculation method in the introduction or discussion section. 6- I am a little confused about the data given in Table2. For example post-embolization : 11/86; emesis: 10/85; INR : 3/70; albumin 21/79 . Please clarify how did you calculate the " n " for this table.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22177

Title: Factors associated with increased incidence of severe toxicities following yttrium-90 resin microspheres

Reviewer's code: 01560036

Reviewer's country: Russia

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-08-18 14:01

Date reviewed: 2015-09-14 19:54

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" 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		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Abstract: you studied toxicity events of grade 3 or more ("methods") but in "results" you presented percents of grade 2 and 3 toxicities. It can to confuse the readers. My advise to keep these data in the main text of the article but to remove them from Abstract. 2. Materials and methods, p.5, paragraph 12: as far as I know when extrahepatic shunting is present, the dose of Y-90 should be increased. Why do you reduce the dose? 3. Discussion, p.9, paragraphs 2-4. This sentence contains 4 words "toxicity" and 3 words "clinical". Some language correction is desirable.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22177

Title: Factors associated with increased incidence of severe toxicities following yttrium-90 resin microspheres

Reviewer's code: 02520549

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-08-18 14:01

Date reviewed: 2015-09-25 15:50:48

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input 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"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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

We need some more details: what is the total number of treatments considered for data collection?

Why the number of follow up is so limited? Death of patients? Other?

Please specify MELD score.

Rewrite tab 2, it is not clear.

Why you reported toxicity events of grade 3 or more (in methods) but in chapter results you introduced percents of grade 2 and 3 toxicities. It is not clear and can make problems.

Take off these data from abstract.

In Materials and methods, p.5, paragraph 12: when extrahepatic shunting is present, the dose of Y-90 should be increased. Why do you reduce the dose? For the risk of radiopneumopathy? please specify language correction is desirable.