

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 10888

Title: Living - donor versus deceased - donor liver transplantation for patients with hepatocellular carcinoma.

Reviewer code: 00926880

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-04-24 22:40

Date reviewed: 2014-04-28 17:09

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have the following comments: (1) This is a review article, not a systematic review. Thus it has the potential bias in choosing the articles to review. (2) It is not clear whether all the articles on deceased-donor liver transplantation were whole liver transplantation. If this is the case, the authors should state this very clearly at the beginning of the article. (3) Reference 4 is incomplete. (4) It is not clear from the title of the article that this is a review article.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 10888

Title: Living - donor versus deceased - donor liver transplantation for patients with hepatocellular carcinoma.

Reviewer code: 01560464

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-04-24 22:40

Date reviewed: 2014-04-30 17:17

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1) The review indicated that the advantages and disadvantages of LDLT and DDLT in treating HCC, especially authors' experience and opinion about LDLT in treating HCC. Some spelling errors need be carefully corrected . 2) I suggest that the article should be published in the form of review.