

# ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7839

**Title:** LASER ABLATION FOR SMALL HEPATOCELLULAR CARCINOMA. State of the Art and Future Perspectives

**Reviewer code:** 00007076

**Science editor:** Su-Xin Gou

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-08 13:25

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-31 16:30

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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review addresses an interesting issue i.e. the use of laser ablation for small hepatocellular carcinoma. The principles and technical details of LA are described in details and the results so far obtained compared with those obtained with the more widely used approaches. Although the issue is of clinical interest and the authors are expert in the field, the way the article is organized and written is less than optimal and needs to be carefully addressed in a revised version. Major Critiques 1. The General Principles are inappropriately detailed and do not fit with the aim of the paper. I suggest having them included as supplementary information. 2. Laser Source and Laser Transmission are too detailed and as the General Principles, must be reported as supplementary information. 3. The Role of Imaging Guidance is unnecessary detailed and must be drastically reduced and focused. 4. A more critical comparison among the different techniques available for the treatment of HCC must be included. The comparison between LA and RF is too narrow and superficial. Other techniques widely used such as surgery or TACE have to be inserted. This will help the reader to understand when and if one should consider a HCC patient for LA. This is the major aim of the Ms. 5. The economic burden of the procedure as compared to RF or TACE needs to be addressed and explained. Why one should invest the rather large amount of money for LA if there no difference with RF or other cheaper techniques? Minor Point The style is somehow difficult to follow. Having the Ms edited by a native English-speaking scientist will help greatly.