

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 23917

Title: Advances in local ablation of malignant liver lesions

Reviewer's code: 00068153

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-12-24 10:57

Date reviewed: 2015-12-28 09:31

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" 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 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

This article reviews the latest status of local ablation therapy for liver tumor. The author presents their experience with different elements of improving local ablation, including the use of microwaves, MR, navigation, robotics and minimal invasive surgical access routes. It is a great help to physicians in the field of liver diseases.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 23917

Title: Advances in local ablation of malignant liver lesions

Reviewer's code: 03004829

Reviewer's country: Sweden

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-12-24 10:57

Date reviewed: 2016-01-11 03:05

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author has written a short but still comprehensive overview of the problems encountered dealing with local ablation of liver tumors and is discussing, if not solutions, so areas of future research. The structure of the paper is clear and informative. However, I have some remarks: There is a comprehensive presentation in the sections of targeting of numbers in mm using this or that technique for needle placement. For example: what is the clinical significance of decreasing the deviation from 2.2 to 1.9 mm? I think the paper would gain on that these exact numbers are deleted and that it is stated that, in general terms, that the deviation is decreased and include some discussion of the significance of this. The richness of details in the targeting section is not reflected in the other sections. A short description of the different physics between MCT and RFA should be added in the section Technical innovations as not all readers are familiar with this. In the same section, I don't understand what means 'in several respects'. In the same section, the statement 'larger tumors' should be put in context preceded by stating the size of tumors targeted with the different methods. I do not understand the last phrase: - is owing a convincing confirmation of superiority to RFA. Please clarify. Imaging: Key references should be inserted after the first



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

sentence. In the second to last paragraph where the success rate of ablations are discussed, the tumor sizes should also be mentioned. Targeting 1: 'Mean time to lesion acquisition' is this wording correct? I don't understand the meaning of the phrase. Targeting 2: is roboter an English word? Please delete 'no wonder' and rephrase 'No wonder, that so far no robotic application had entered standard treatment algorithms and approved clinical pathways' for clarity. Although interesting I believe that the last paragraph about Go should be deleted.