

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 24662

Title: Therapeutic usability of two different fiducial gold markers for robotic stereotactic radiosurgery of liver malignancies: Pilot study

Reviewer's code: 02520041

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2016-01-31 16:08

Date reviewed: 2016-02-01 23:02

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | 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"/> The same title | <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"/> 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 | | [Y] No | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | BPG Search: | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | [Y] No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Reviewer's comments: In this work, authors reported a comparison study of two different types of fiducial markers for robotic radiosurgery. In this study, 15 patients have been recruited, in which 48 gold markers were placed (32 Grain shaped markers and 16 Gold Anchor). All these patients except one were scanned with CT for visualization and identification of these markers. The data of these patients were analyzed and reported in this work. The work intended to address an interesting clinical issue. However, there are several weaknesses to be addressed. Major critics: 1) In this work, a limited literature review was provided in the section of introduction. A more comprehensive review is expected. 2) It would be helpful to summarize the workflow in a flow chart for easy appreciation. 3) Given various grammar and style issues, it is strongly recommended that the manuscript shall be proof reviewed by a native English speaker or an adequate alternative. 4) The focus of the work is visualization and identification of these markers, which could be used for any type of radiotherapy treatments. Also, the work lacks the data on the analysis of tracking accuracy during treatment. The title shall be revised, and clarification shall be



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

provided to avoid potential confusion it may cause. 5) As stated in the work, grain markers are bigger than anchor markers. Generally speaking, bigger markers shall have better visualization by CT. This is consistent with the results reported by the work: the CT visualization of grain markers was better than anchor markers. Motivation and justification of the work shall be highlighted and clarified. 6) It would be useful to illustrate US and CT images of both grain markers and anchor markers for easy appreciation, along with quantitative CT number analysis of the two markers.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 24662

Title: Therapeutic usability of two different fiducial gold markers for robotic stereotactic radiosurgery of liver malignancies: Pilot study

Reviewer's code: 03472666

Reviewer's country: Romania

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2016-01-31 16:08

Date reviewed: 2016-03-02 14:20

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I support the publication of this paper without any further corrections.