



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Reviewer's code:** 00054465

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an excellent overview of the current status of the management of hepatocellular cancer and survival. The role and outcomes of the use of locoregional therapy is critically analyzed. The conclusions from the available data are appropriate.

### AUTHORS RESPONSE

We thank the Review for the positive comments regarding our Editorial.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Reviewer's code:** 00053888

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish		<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> General
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This topic is useful and valid to review but the submitted manuscript needs to follow a more conventional pattern of presentation should include a review of the whole literature base and needs to have extensive grammatical correction. There also needs to be some tables and or figures to help a reader easily understand the topic.

### AUTHORS RESPONSE

We thank the Review for his comments. The present study is an Editorial, as a consequence, we did not performed a systematic review of the literature requiring the creation of tables or figures specifically focused on this topic.

We extensively worked on English style, obtaining the quality approval from native speakers of our University and from an internationally recognized text editing system.



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Reviewer's code:** 02954069

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> General
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a good editorial which, I think, merits publication in WJG.

### AUTHORS RESPONSE

We thank the Review for his positive comments.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Reviewer's code:** 00053958

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2018-05-19

**Date reviewed:** 2018-05-23

**Review time:** 3 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is an overall good discussion on the issue of pre transplant loco regional therapy as a bridge to liver transplantation and the authors discussed some recent publications. I would like to see an expansion of their discussion to include the following points: 1) to point out that the described benefit of loco regional treatments in the recent Pommergaard study is small although it appears to be statistically significant (69.7 vs. 65.8%; P<0.001) 2) the latest study shows that 1-2 treatments have better survival but once again this may represent better biology i.e. better response of HCC to treatment and



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

I think this is broadly in line with previous evidence and is not very different. 3) to discuss why RFA and RFA + TACE maybe better- it could be due to higher efficacy of RFA and also due to tumor selection (perhaps HCC treated with RFA is smaller in size than HCC treated with TACE). 4) I would like to see a discussion of the fact that local allocation rules and wait time variations may play a huge role in this. In the US for example, most HCC patients have to wait for at least 6 months from diagnosis before getting MELD exception points.

#### **AUTHORS RESPONSE**

We thank the Review for his comments. We answer point-by-point t the criticisms reported by the Reviewer.

1) We think the significance showed in the study from Pommergaard et al., although minimal, is incontrovertible. In fact, the great numerosity of the study (n=4,978) justifies a significant statistical effect, although only a 4% of difference was reported. Such a situation can well explain why small sample studies often fail to demonstrate the efficacy of LRT. In other terms, the effect can be captured only in case of huge numbers.

2) We agree. Difficult to obtain a definitive clarification of the real effect of LRT. They may be only a surrogate of the real discriminative parameter, namely the aggressiveness of the tumor. No definitive data can be obtained from the present study.

3) We agree. The presently discussed paper was not able to fully clarify this aspect.

4) We agree with the Reviewer. We added the following sentence in the text:

*"Moreover, we should remember the important impact that local allocation rules and waiting time duration may play on the role and the effect of LRT. As an example, in the US most HCC patients wait for at least six months from the diagnosis before having the opportunity to be transplanted. More studies also focused on these aspects are surely needed."*



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Reviewer's code:** 00051373

**Reviewer's country:** Taiwan

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very pertinent editorial suggesting that the LRT is benefit for the outcomes of liver transplantation. I am much agreeing with Prof. Lai regarding the point of view.

### AUTHORS RESPONSE

We thank the Review for his positive comments.



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Reviewer's code:** 02861333

**Reviewer's country:** China

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review paper summerized the recent studies for Locoregional therapy before LT for HCC. The META analysis or RCT study should be furthered.

### AUTHORS RESPONSE

We thank the Review for his comments. We totally agree about the necessity of perform studies more solid from the statistical point of view.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Reviewer's code:** 02860897

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Milan criteria was widely used as indication for liver transplantation in patients with HCC. Several investigators tried to revise Milan criteria because local therapy for HCC has remarkably improved. This editorial is not only very timely but also very useful because authors summarized the present status of locoregional therapy for HCC. Authors' description is very appropriate and no further comments.

### AUTHORS RESPONSE

We thank the Review for his positive comments.