

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 13602

Title: Percutaneous Microwave ablation versus Radiofrequency ablation in the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma

Reviewer's code: 02445428

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-08-30 11:44

Date reviewed: 2014-09-19 16:33

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this review, Poulou et al. compare the advantages, disadvantages and therapeutic efficacy between Radiofrequency (RFA) and microwave ablation (MWA) for treatment of HCC. 1. There are some spelling errors. For example, in the Abstract: Surgical rejection (line 2) -> resection. 2. This manuscript might need English editing. 3. This review should focus on MWA vs. RFA. The Introduction part is too long (page 3 to upper part of page 6). Newer RFA equipment, such as multipolar needle, is not discussed. 4. Evolving MWA and RFA instruments 5. In the conclusion section (page 13), the authors state "RFA and MWA constitute the backbone of palliative treatments in HCC". This is not appropriate. RFA and MWA are categorized as curative treatments. 6. The authors can give more instructive comments in the conclusion section. 7. Table 1 is redundant. The authors can refer the readers to the major HCC guidelines for BCLC staging.