

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 33249

Title: Usefulness of the MESH score in a European hepatocellular carcinoma cohort

Reviewer's code: 00068723

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2017-02-09 08:13

Date reviewed: 2017-02-09 14:11

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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

The authors compared performance of scoring systems of hepatocellular carcinoma, focusing on MESH and BCLC. They found that MESH was more useful for selection of treatment, or management. Table 1 and table 2 were interesting. It would be more appropriate to emphasize the limitation of BCLC citing references. With the information, performance of MESH would be more convincing.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 33249

Title: Usefulness of the MESH score in a European hepatocellular carcinoma cohort

Reviewer's code: 03646554

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2017-02-09 08:13

Date reviewed: 2017-02-13 21:51

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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

The authors illustrated the value of the new scoring systems of hepatocellular carcinoma, through the comparison with other scoring systems. They found that MESH was more effective for the HCC management especially they can provide us with good prognostic information. Tables are great. It would be more clear if making the table of information of the European HCC cohort.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 33249

Title: Usefulness of the MESH score in a European hepatocellular carcinoma cohort

Reviewer's code: 03538749

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2017-02-09 08:13

Date reviewed: 2017-02-18 23:29

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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

Hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) staging system is still a controversial issue. So this letter gave me an interesting news for future prediction. However, I can not know what is MESH and How the authors have used it in this letter. In addition ,how to compare these staging systems? Finally, I can not get the following paper so as to know its detail. Hsu CY, Liu PH, Hsia CY, Lee YH, Al Juboori A, Lee RC, et al. Nomogram of the Barcelona Clinic Liver Cancer system for individual prognostic prediction in hepatocellular carcinoma. Liver Int. 2016;36(10):1498-506. doi: 10.1111/liv.13114. PubMed PMID: 26972815