

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 23984

**Title:** Missing metastases as a model to challenge current therapeutic algorithms in colorectal liver metastases

**Reviewer's code:** 00069105

**Reviewer's country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-12-30 14:29

**Date reviewed:** 2016-01-09 01:11

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 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 checked="" 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

Dear authors: You have reviewed a very interesting topic. The paper is easy to read but interesting but I think that many changes should be done to improve it. Reviews now has evolved from classical review to systematic review or meta-analysis. PRISMA rules has been written defining how to do these reviews. The search has to be defined, the key words used, numbers of papers read and so on. Your review is a nice classical review but I think that now only systematic reviews should be accepted (it is my own opinion). Minor comments. An structured abstract should be done. As you see I did not comment nothing about papaer because the paper is not the problem.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 23984

**Title:** Missing metastases as a model to challenge current therapeutic algorithms in colorectal liver metastases

**Reviewer's code:** 02831764

**Reviewer's country:** Australia

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-12-30 14:29

**Date reviewed:** 2016-01-23 17:17

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"/> No	<input 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

no corrections

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 23984

**Title:** Missing metastases as a model to challenge current therapeutic algorithms in colorectal liver metastases

**Reviewer's code:** 02536988

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-12-30 14:29

**Date reviewed:** 2016-01-29 05:45

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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

This article is very interesting. However, there has no prospective trial that watch-and-wait strategy was conducted against MLMs. So, I think there is a big jump in logic in your claim. I recommend you should plan a prospective trial.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 23984

**Title:** Missing metastases as a model to challenge current therapeutic algorithms in colorectal liver metastases

**Reviewer's code:** 00058210

**Reviewer's country:** France

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-12-30 14:29

**Date reviewed:** 2016-01-20 21:54

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ Y ] Grade A: Excellent	[ Y ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ Y ] No	[ Y ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[ Y ] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Please find my reviewing and a reference really interesting manuscript.

Reviewing of the manuscript entitled «Missing Liver Metastases... » submitted to World Journal of Gastroenterology.

It is a really well written manuscript, with an update of the recent references related to this specific topic and a critical analysis, interesting and original, of our current management of the patients presenting colorectal liver metastasis. It is more a personal point of view than a real review of the literature, however, the manuscript is really easy to read and interesting.

P6, lignes 9 : « It is postulated that it is the combination of these 2 factors that is responsible for major improvements in post-surgical outcomes ». Yes, in case of resection in the setting of advanced metastatic, the good prognosis observed is not linked only to the selection of patients by the bias of a good response to CT as it has been described in the pivotal publication of Brouquet et al in the model



## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

of two stage hepatectomy (Brouquet et al JCO). This reference can be added and use to illustrate the propos of the authors.