

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 6286

**Title:** Surgery for Colorectal Liver Metastases: the Evolution of Determining Prognosis

**Reviewer code:** 00916498

**Science editor:** Wen, Ling-Ling

**Date sent for review:** 2013-10-12 15:51

**Date reviewed:** 2013-10-16 00:02

| CLASSIFICATION           | LANGUAGE EVALUATION                             | RECOMMENDATION | CONCLUSION                        |
|--------------------------|---|----------------|-----------------------------------|
| [ Y] Grade A (Excellent) | [ Y] Grade A: Priority Publishing               | Google Search: | [ Y] Accept                       |
| [ ] Grade B (Very good)  | [ ] Grade B: minor language polishing           | [ ] Existed    | [ ] High priority for publication |
| [ ] Grade C (Good)       | [ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing | [ ] No records | [ ] Rejection                     |
| [ ] Grade D (Fair)       | [ ] Grade D: rejected                           | BPG Search:    | [ ] Minor revision                |
| [ ] Grade E (Poor)       |   | [ ] Existed    | [ ] Major revision                |
|                          |   | [ ] No records |                                   |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a review article examining factors which influence prognosis in patients with colorectal cancer with liver metastases. It addresses historic aspects, multiple-factor prognostic scores and the newer areas of genetic mutation analysis. The article is very well written, comprehensive, clear and a useful update for clinicians with an interest in this area. It should be published. Ajith Siriwardena MD FRCS Professor of Hepatobiliary Surgery

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 6286

**Title:** Surgery for Colorectal Liver Metastases: the Evolution of Determining Prognosis

**Reviewer code:** 00209921

**Science editor:** Wen, Ling-Ling

**Date sent for review:** 2013-10-12 15:51

**Date reviewed:** 2013-10-27 07:16

| CLASSIFICATION  | LANGUAGE EVALUATION  | RECOMMENDATION                      | 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"/> Existed    | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of                | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)                 | language polishing   | BPG Search:                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Existed    | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No records |  |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well written overview. Little to criticize. A correction is however required on Page 13: text " In a separate study, Blazer et al. ... In this group of patients, 75% had a complete response (no residual cancer cells), 56% a major response (1% to 49% residual cancer cells), and 33% a minor response (> or = 50% residual cancer cells)." is factually incorrect. This study reported on 9% pCR, 36% major response, and 55% minor response.