



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Room 903, Building D, Ocean International Center,
No.62 Dongsihuan Zhonglu, Chaoyang District, Beijing 100025, China
Telephone: +86-10-8538-1892 Fax: +86-10-8538-1893
E-mail: bpg@baishideng.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Ms: 1459

Title: CHEMOTHERAPY FOR CHOLANGIOCARCINOMA: AN UPDATE

Reviewer code: 00724450

Science editor: h.h.zhai@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2012-12-13 18:42

Date reviewed: 2012-12-28 04:00

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" 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 language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

The authors submitted a manuscript by title "CHEMOTHERAPY FOR CHOLANGIOCARCINOMA: AN UPDATE". The manuscript is well designed, review the literature clearly and also contain the guidelines. The also presented new and well studies in the literature. I think we need a update about this subject.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Ms: 1459

Title: CHEMOTHERAPY FOR CHOLANGIOCARCINOMA: AN UPDATE

Reviewer code: 00183219

Science editor: h.h.zhai@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2012-12-13 18:42

Date reviewed: 2013-01-04 22:57

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

Review of 'Chemotherapy for cholangiocarcinoma: an update' Overall despite flowing in a logical manner this review was very difficult to read due to multiple language errors which need addressing. The paper does present a comprehensive review of current literature with salient articles highlighted but there are however many similar papers already in print e.g. Chemotherapy for the biliary tract cancers: moving toward improved survival time. Romit A et al. Journal of gastrointestinal cancer. Sept 2012. With regards to its content: Recently published guidance in GUT states that there is no role for adjuvant chemotherapy in cholangiocarcinomas but this is not made clear in this review and in fact this section is quite muddled. The studies used in the section mostly demonstrated a non significant association between the use of chemotherapy adjuvantly to improve survival and I feel this needs to be stressed further. There is also no mention of the Bilcap study which has the potential to show significant benefit from adjuvant chemo. Though the title states that this will be a review of chemotherapy alone there is also discussion about radiotherapy for locally advanced disease. This is well evidenced but perhaps with its addition there is a need to include over therapies such as photodynamic therapy and embolization. The conclusions for the review though relevant need to be more succinct. They have only included conclusions from the last section of the review (systemic therapy). Perhaps a general conclusion would work better here? Referencing: For all references only the first author is included which is not consistent with the vancouver referencing style.