

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15984

Title: Isolated limb infusion chemotherapy with or without hemofiltration for recurrent limb melanoma

Reviewer's code: 00722674

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-12-22 08:17

Date reviewed: 2015-03-11 08:57

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input 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 type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, congratulations on your remarkable results with ILI! I was very interested to read your paper despite the small number number of patients because i wanted to see what new/different you have found from your experience with ILI. Unfortunately I could not find this in the introduction of the paper and this is sth that makes it not appealing for the readers. Therefore it is absolutely necessary to state in the introduction why this report can be interesting for someone to read. Moreover, a significant improvement of the structure and the language is necessary before any consideration for publication. I hope that the following comments will help you to this direction. Why do the authors consider their results preliminary. What "final" results are expected? Title should be <12words (see instructions for authors) Running title should be provided. Affiliation pls correct "departement" Pls adjust abstract word count according to the instruction for authors. In the abstract, if numbers and % are to be presented , it is sound to give the number and then the % in brackets. Pls correct "3 patient" Abstract, conclusion why is ILI easily repeated? Do you have results to support this? Did you repeat the procedure to any patient? Pls state in the abstract or remove

statement from conclusions. The first 7 lines of the introduction are very general, they do not support the rationale for the study and should be omitted. The use of a table to compare ILP with ILI in the introduction is unsound and it does not support the study. The introduction is very long and a lot of space is given to describe ILP which is not the point of the paper. Please limit the introduction to 1-2 paragraphs no more than 400 words in total finishing with the aim of the study. It should be clear why the study is interesting for someone to read. Authors state that the patients treated over a 14 yr period gave their consent for the study. So, was the study prospective or retrospective. In the former case consent would not be possible as many of the patients would have died. Pls explain. Was there any reason to select ILI over ILP? In other words were these, high surgical risk patients? From their performance status this is not evident. Pls give details regarding the haemofilter (type). Did you use it to clear the blood after the ILI before you give the limb back to the systemic circulation? So, the limb was w/o oxygenation for at least 75min. Is that right? Did you use hyperthermia at all? What is the author's opinion about that? Was this a standard ILI protocol (Thompson's) or have you modified it? Why did you do CT scans to assess tumours that are superficial and very easily assessable? Response in 30 days may well underestimate your results. Responses evolve even after 3 months. What was the rationale behind serial angiograms? They bear significant risks and you also did CT scans to assess response. At which time point did you assess QoL? Do you have any particular criteria for selecting cytotoxic agents? Did any of the patient have distant metastasis? Were there any palpable nodes? Any LNDs performed? What were the presenting symptoms? The first paragraph of the discussion refers to treatments irrelevant with ILI and should be omitted. In the conclusion targeted treatments are discussed which are not the subject of the manuscript. The authors do not discuss their results adequately compared with those published in the literature. Has the haemofiltration helped at all? What about the patients who had a repeat procedure? Which combination of chemotherapy (if any) is the best according to your study? Any systemic complications? Did you measure systemic leak? Did you have evidence of systemic to limb leak? Reference style is not according to the WJCO. Sincerely.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15984

Title: Isolated limb infusion chemotherapy with or without hemofiltration for recurrent limb melanoma

Reviewer's code: 00209021

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-12-22 08:17

Date reviewed: 2015-03-03 16:09

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 checked="" 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"/> 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

1. Introduction section should be shortened. 2. Characteristics of the three patients who failed the treatment would be better to be presented in a different table. 3. English syntax and grammar errors must be corrected. 4. Conclusion section can be transferred into the Discussion section, the authors must conclude with one or two sentences. 5. References must be uniform and suitable with the journal's style.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15984

Title: Isolated limb infusion chemotherapy with or without hemofiltration for recurrent limb melanoma

Reviewer's code: 00608195

Reviewer's country: Portugal

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-12-22 08:17

Date reviewed: 2014-12-28 06:58

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> 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

This is a retrospective review of the experience of one centre in isolated limb infusion (ILI) as a regional treatment of melanoma localized to a limb. The sample is short but the article is well written. It is their experience and their results. It does not bring anything new but serves to underline a procedure that is effective, simpler and less invasive than surgically isolated limb perfusion.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15984

Title: Isolated limb infusion chemotherapy with or without hemofiltration for recurrent limb melanoma

Reviewer's code: 00181182

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-12-22 08:17

Date reviewed: 2015-02-25 23:36

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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

There are no obvious flaws in the statistical workup. The analysis itself is done according to standards. The topic itself is not very innovative. Some language flaws should be corrected by a native speaker. Table 1 describing the differences between Infusion and Perfusion can be omitted as this does not contribute significant information to the results. Please remove the term "study" as this is a retrospective analysis of a case series. Please provide a STROBE statement ahead of possible publication.