

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 16620

Title: Perspective of laparoscopic liver resection for hepatocellular carcinoma

Reviewer's code: 00054371

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-01-28 15:06

Date reviewed: 2015-02-23 14:22

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"/> 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"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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

The authors wrote an editorial titled "Perspective of laparoscopic liver resection for hepatocellular carcinoma – laparoscopic approach of liver resection is theoretically superior to open approach in some aspects, good visibility of the operative field in the subphrenic space of the costal cage with the liver inside -," which was based on the review and meta-analysis of the 2nd international consensus conference on laparoscopic liver resection. I don't have any serious comment on this candidate editorial. I enumerated several minor comments below. What does the author consider as contraindications for LLR in HCC patients at the present time? In Page 4, the reference number [11] should be [5]. In Page 6, "reference number 17" should be "[17]." In the sentence, "There are 5 comparative studies for HCC with 100% rate of LC patients[31,33,36,42,45,53], in Page 9, "5" probably should be "6."

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 16620

Title: Perspective of laparoscopic liver resection for hepatocellular carcinoma

Reviewer's code: 02860814

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-01-28 15:06

Date reviewed: 2015-03-04 04:09

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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read with great interest the Editorial by Zenichi Morise focusing on the advantages of laparoscopic liver resection for HCC compared to open surgery. The author reviews the data from the 2nd international consensus conference on laparoscopic liver resection. ? For the acceptance of this paper, a minor language polishing is needed (e.g. "...the patients of hepatocellular carcinoma" in page 2, "...review of the literatures..." in page 2, "...are the best hopes for cure" in page 4, "...especially after repeat treatments..." in page 5). ? I do not also obtain a clear view of how the tables will be shown due to the unstructured form submitted here. ? Finally, in the legend of the figure, apart from the description there is also a paragraph that is repeated exactly in the main text, so for this reason it can be omitted from the legend.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 16620

Title: Perspective of laparoscopic liver resection for hepatocellular carcinoma

Reviewer's code: 02861134

Reviewer's country: Bulgaria

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-01-28 15:06

Date reviewed: 2015-02-25 01:31

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 checked="" 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 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"/> 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

The paper makes original contribution. The paper is well organized. Author Guidelines has been followed properly in preparing the manuscript.