



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14748

Title: Comparison of two different laparotomy methods in modeling rabbit VX2 hepatocarcinoma

Reviewer’s code: 02539179

Reviewer’s country: China

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-10-28 08:49

Date reviewed: 2014-12-18 03:48

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed 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 checked="" 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 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

In this paper two methodologies of explanted hepatocellular carcinoma models in rabbit were introduced. One is by direct embedding the tumor particles into the liver with tweezers. Another one is by injecting tumor particles into the liver through a 15G syringe needle. The formation of tumors, operation time, incision length, incision infection rate, mortality rate were then compared between the two groups. The results indicated that the injection method was better in inducing less injury, mortality, and less celiac planting. It has been a long time that researchers use the method of injection (either directly into the liver or sub-capsularily) to plant the tumor particles into the liver for generating HCC models, instead of directly embedding the tumor particles into the liver with tweezers. The study didn’t compare the growth rate of explanted HCC by two methods in immune intact animals. The language needs to be improved for a final publication in English.



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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14748

Title: Comparison of two different laparotomy methods in modeling rabbit VX2 hepatocarcinoma

Reviewer's code: 02941540

Reviewer's country: Ireland

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-10-28 08:49

Date reviewed: 2014-12-05 19:33

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

This is an important field of study and the authors examine an interesting approach. Overall the writing and phrasing should be improved. In addition, the weakness of the various models could be discussed more. Indeed, the most interesting aspect to the study may rather be the description of the method as the results are so dramatic related to sample size. Therefore the text should more closely reflect the procedural aspect of the study. Furthermore, the tables could be presented better and also the pictures could be of better quality. The authors may consider the inclusion of a summary diagram regarding the new approach.