

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Radiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 31826

**Title:** Transarterial chemoembolization using 40  $\mu$ m drug eluting beads for hepatocellular carcinoma

**Reviewer's code:** 03074879

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-12-13 08:11

**Date reviewed:** 2016-12-21 18:01

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" 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

Transarterial Chemoembolization is a effective way for the treatment of HCC , so the topic of paper is novel and design of comparison is precise This article as a whole is good ,but there is a little wrong with language. In the Materials and Methods section of abstract , the number of patients using "forty-eight", but other number using "48". I think the number should have a Consistent expression.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Radiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 31826

**Title:** Transarterial chemoembolization using 40  $\mu$ m drug eluting beads for hepatocellular carcinoma

**Reviewer's code:** 02936822

**Reviewer's country:** France

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-12-13 08:11

**Date reviewed:** 2016-12-22 16:51

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 thank the authors for this interesting series of patients. I would only comment on minor points: - Please clarify the patients that were initially within Milan criteria: there should be at least some drop-out from the transplant list, or other patients within Milan but with contra-indication for transplantation. - The result section "radiological tumor response in non transplanted patients" seem to refer at least partially to all patients. Please amend the text. Please also explicitly provide the number of patients analyzed for response. - The response from a patient basis (overall response of all lesion in a patient, according to RECIST) would be interesting to show.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Radiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 31826

**Title:** Transarterial chemoembolization using 40  $\mu$ m drug eluting beads for hepatocellular carcinoma

**Reviewer's code:** 03536637

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-12-13 08:11

**Date reviewed:** 2016-12-29 10:20

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

Comments to authors This paper presented about the efficacy of transarterial chemoembolization using drug eluting beads for HCC patients. This topic could be interesting for readers of World Journal of Radiology. However, there are many missing information and several problems with this cohort study. 1. First of all, the aim of this study is not clear. Did authors analyzed the efficacy of DEB-TACE for patients waiting for transplant? Or compared cTACE vs DEB-TACE? Please clarify the study design. How many patients did they enroll the study? Regarding DEB-TACE, many papers have been published. It was not new. 2. What is the criteria for DEB-TACE in this study? Over 90% patients were Child A and 43% of participants were BCLC-A. Why didn't these patients underwent hepatectomy? 3. Regarding OLT patients, please clarify the duration of waiting time and indication of liver transplant in your institute. The author mentioned that 50% of patients experienced tumor progression. How many patients got down-staging in this study? 4. Basically this study had small number, single arm, and retrospective data. These results had small impact on the hypothesis.