

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14447

Title: Radiofrequency ablation of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma – the past, the present and the future

Reviewer code: 02445558

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-10-05 10:44

Date reviewed: 2014-11-23 19:28

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have written a nicely presented review on radiofrequency ablation but the format should be structured with subheadings to make it more legible, as it looks more an editorial than a review. Overall it is a good effort and reads well. I have few comments: The final paragraph and relative reference (nr34), discussing RFA for pancreatic NET should be removed. It is a single paragraph, completely irrelevant in this context. On the other hand, the publication from Keane et al (WJG 2014), discussing various modalities of ablation of pancreatic cancer should be quoted, as it is a relevant and comparative review. The table illustrating results from RFA should be reformatted and a column with median survival for each study added as this is probably the most important information for the readers and does not emerge clearly from the current table.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14447

Title: Radiofrequency ablation of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma - the past, the present and the future

Reviewer code: 00039529

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-10-05 10:44

Date reviewed: 2014-11-16 01:06

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Summary is incomplete as it stands as no effort is made to quantitate complications in adenocarcinomas of the pancreatic head treated by RFA, and the control group of palliative Whipple is not offered for comparison. Without this information, how can one determine the future of RFA?
Edward L Bradley III

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14447

Title: Radiofrequency ablation of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma - the past, the present and the future

Reviewer code: 02731744

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-10-05 10:44

Date reviewed: 2014-11-16 20:45

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is not sufficient data about RFA for pancreatic cancer although type of paper is mini-review. Rate of adverse events are not sufficiently mentioned about RFA as well as EUS-guided RFA. In addition, Interventional EUS using cryoablation has been reported, and this method may be safety compared with conventional RFA. This method should be more described. And Table is very busy. Separate for several terms and section.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14447

Title: Radiofrequency ablation of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma - the past, the present and the future

Reviewer code: 00009064

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-10-05 10:44

Date reviewed: 2014-11-16 22:28

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very timely review and good coverage of the existing literature.